

The Department of State

ORIGINATOR LIBRARY

FEB 20 1956

bulletin

Vol. XXXIV, No. 867

February 6, 1956



**EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN
PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND SOVIET PRE-
MIER BULGANIN 191**

**INTEGRATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COOPER-
ATION ADMINISTRATION WITHIN THE DE-
PARTMENT OF STATE • *Statement by Secretary
Dulles* 211**

**U.S.-INDIAN COOPERATION FOR ECONOMIC DE-
VELOPMENT • *by Ambassador John Sherman Cooper* . 205**

**A HISTORICAL VIEW OF AMERICAN FOREIGN
POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST • *by Ambassador
Donald R. Heath* 202**

**THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY: REPORT TO THE
PRESIDENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED
JUNE 30, 1955 215**

For index see inside back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXXIV, No. 867 • PUBLICATION 6279

February 6, 1956

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
62 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Exchange of Correspondence Between President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Bulganin

White House press release dated January 28

THE PRESIDENT TO PREMIER BULGANIN¹

January 28, 1956

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to thank you for your letter of January twenty-third, delivered to me by Ambassador Zaroubin. I have given it careful thought.

Let me say at the outset that I do indeed believe that the present international situation requires all states, particularly the great powers, to seek to lessen international tension and strengthen international confidence and cooperation.

As the power of destruction grows, it becomes imperative not merely to strive to control and limit that power, but also to do away with antagonisms which could tempt men to use that power. That view, I can assure you, is held by the people of the United States and by their political leaders without any exception whatsoever.

I am confident that that view is also shared by all the peoples of the world, and that those who have been entrusted with political authority have a high duty to respond to the universal longing of the peoples for peace.

As you are good enough to recall, I have more than once alluded to the immensely valuable asset we have in the historic friendship between our peoples. I profoundly believe that upon that foundation better political relations could be established. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that there is in the whole world no people more sincerely dedicated to building a structure of peace than the American people. Our whole nation longs for a cessation of the strains and dangers now present in the international situation. There is indeed no honorable thing that we would not do if we were convinced that it would promote a just peace in the world.

¹ President Eisenhower's letter was delivered by Ambassador Bohlen at Moscow on Jan. 28.

It is from this viewpoint that I have examined your present suggestion that the cause of peace would now be served by the conclusion between our countries of a treaty of friendship and cooperation of twenty years duration.

I first observe that our countries are already bound to each other by a solemn treaty—the Charter of the United Nations. The treaty which you now propose would consist of three substantive articles. I observe also that each one of these is already covered by the explicit provisions in this United Nations treaty between us.

The first article of your draft would bind our two countries to develop friendly relations between our peoples on the basis of equal rights, mutual respect and non-interference in internal affairs. As members of the United Nations we are already bound through that organization "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples".

The second article of your proposed treaty would bind us to settle our international disputes by peaceful means alone. This is an undertaking to which our two countries are already bound by the provisions of Article 2 (3) of the Charter of the United Nations which specifies that "all members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means".

The third article would bind us to the strengthening of economic, cultural and scientific cooperation. Chapter IX of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with "International Economic and Social Cooperation" pledges us to work for "solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems", and to "international cultural and educational cooperation".

The Charter of the United Nations constitutes a solemn treaty not only between your country and our own—it is a treaty among many countries, all of whom are bound to us and to each other, and all of whom are concerned with world peace. The

American people sincerely desire to help make reality of these charter goals.

But the present state of international tension was not prevented by the words of the Charter. How can we hope that the present situation would be cured merely by repeating those words in a bilateral form?

I wonder whether again going through a treaty-making procedure, and this time on a bilateral basis only, might indeed work against the cause of peace by creating the illusion that a stroke of a pen had achieved a result which in fact can be obtained only by a change of spirit.

Friendly collaboration between states depends not solely upon treaty promises but upon the spirit that animates the governments of the states concerned and upon actual performance.

It was in the hope of promoting such a spirit and such performance that I went to Geneva last July, a course which had no peacetime precedent in American history. Despite the doubts of many that the mission would, in fact, serve any useful purpose, I felt that the existing situation was so serious that no chance for improvement, however slight, ought to be neglected. In Geneva you expressed similar views and aspirations.

I had earnestly hoped that out of that meeting with you and with the Heads of Government of France and the United Kingdom would come a bettering of international relations, especially as between the four nations there represented and in relation to particular problems for which our four nations had a particular responsibility.

Unhappily, the American people have had sadly to conclude that the events following our meeting have not given substance to their hope.

Permit me to recall to your mind a short record of recent events.

At Geneva we directed our Foreign Ministers to propose effective means for the solution of three specific problems.

The first of these problems was that of European security and Germany. We explicitly agreed that the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by means of free elections should be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security. However, despite constructive proposals put forward by the three Western powers for German reunification and European security, your Government felt that it could not at this time entertain any proposal

dealing with the reunification of Germany by means of free elections.

The second problem was that of disarmament. In our Geneva discussion of that problem I made my "open skies" proposal in the hope that we might actually do something to convince the world that we had no aggressive purposes against each other. But this proposal your Government rejected at the Foreign Ministers meeting.

The third problem was the development of contacts between East and West. The Western Ministers proposed many concrete measures to bring about closer relations and better understanding, none of which was accepted by your Government. Despite that fact there has, as you point out, recently been some improvement in contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

A further deterioration has taken place because to us it has seemed that your Government had, in various areas of the world, embarked upon a course which increases tensions by intensifying hatreds and animosities implicit in historic international disputes. I share your conviction that an improvement in Soviet-American relations is urgently needed. But frankly, our people find it difficult to reconcile what appears to us to be the purposes of your Government in these areas with your present words—words which so rightly emphasize the special responsibility of our Governments to lessen international tension and strengthen confidence and cooperation between states.

I deal with the history of this past year solely for the purpose of enabling us with better prospect of success to chart our future. This nation holds out the hand of friendship to all who would grasp it in sincerity. I have often said, and I now repeat, that there is nothing I would not do to promote peace with justice for the world. But we know that it is deeds and not words alone which count.

Consider, Mr. Chairman, what a vast change would be effected not only in our relations but throughout the entire world if there were prompt measures to reunify Germany in freedom within the framework of security; if there were carried out our wartime pledge to respect the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; if there were arranged such mutual opening of our countries to inspection that the possibilities of surprise attack would vanish

and if reductions of armament were made practical, with the release of productive power for the betterment of mankind. Consider, also, the mountain of distrust and misunderstanding that would disappear if our peoples freely exchanged news, information, visits and ideas.

These are all matters which you and I have discussed together at Geneva. They are results to which my nation remains dedicated and toward which we are prepared at any moment to move in a spirit of conciliation. May I hope, from your letter, that you too are dedicated to these great ends?

I shall look forward to receiving a further expression of your views.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

PREMIER BULGANIN TO THE PRESIDENT

THE KREMLIN, MOSCOW
January 23, 1956

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the firm conviction that you share my concern over the present state of the relations between our countries, I should like to impart to you my ideas regarding possible means of improving those relations.

You, I am sure, agree with me that the present international situation requires all States, particularly the Great Powers, which bear special responsibility for assuring world-wide peace and the security of nations, to take measures that may help further to lessen international tension and strengthen confidence and cooperation between States. This would satisfy the heartfelt longing of peoples to live in peace and tranquility and to devote their material resources and energy to creative and constructive work, cultural advancement, and prosperity.

At the Meeting of the Heads of Government of the Four Powers at Geneva, we all expressed our readiness to strive for a lessening of international tension and an improvement in relations between States in accordance with the principles of peaceful coexistence and economic cooperation.

There is no doubt that for any future lessening of international tension the question of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States has special significance.

This raises the problem of the necessity for taking steps to improve substantially the relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America. Such improvement of Soviet-American relations would be a genuine contribution toward ameliorating the entire international situation and maintaining and consolidating world peace.

The history of the relations between our countries is convincing proof of the fact that their friendly cooperation, based on a striving for mutual understanding, mutual

respect for sovereignty, and which was later based on the common struggle against the forces of aggression, satisfies the highest interests of the peoples of both countries.

It is certainly not by accident that, with the exception of the period of foreign intervention against the young Soviet Republic, the peoples of our States have never fought each other; that between them there have never been and are not now any irreconcilable differences, nor any frontiers or territories that might become an object of dispute or conflict.

This is why the Soviet people received with complete understanding your statement at the Conference of the Heads of Government of the Four Powers at Geneva, in which you remarked: "The American people would like to be friends of the Soviet people. There are no disputes between the American and Soviet peoples, there are no conflicts between them, there is no commercial hostility. Historically our peoples have always lived in peace."

Life itself has proven that cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. has been based, not on accidental and short-lived motives but on fundamental and enduring interests. This found a significant manifestation, first of all, in the fact that our countries were allies during both World Wars.

You, as one of the outstanding military leaders of the anti-Hitler coalition, are especially aware of the fact that the military cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States during the years of the Second World War played a most important part in crushing the common foe—the Fascist aggressors. Bound by the ties of blood shed by the best sons of the people of both countries, their military alliance, which was also shared by Great Britain, France, China, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Greece, and other countries of the coalition of freedom-loving peoples, endured with honor all trials of the war, which was thrust upon our peoples by the forces of aggression in the West and in the East.

It is highly regrettable that in the postwar period the relations of friendship and cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. should have worsened. The impairment of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, whatever the reasons may be, is contrary to the interests of both the Soviet and the American peoples and adversely affects the entire international situation.

I am sure that you, like myself, are convinced that the differences between the social structures of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. should not prevent our countries from maintaining the political, economic, and cultural relations in which our peoples are interested. In the years preceding the Second World War, Soviet-American relations progressed considerably, especially in the economic field. During the war the relations between our countries reached new heights, which was due to the wide support of the peoples of our countries and which strengthened their mutual sympathies. This helped shorten the war and lessen the sacrifices of nations.

It is of course impossible not to take account of the fact that during the period of the "cold war" between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. serious disagreements have arisen with regard to various international problems connected with disarmament, the assurance of security in

Europe, the German question, together with certain problems of the Far East, and the importance of the above-mentioned problems is recognized. At the last meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Four Powers at Geneva, even with the narrowing of the gap between the positions of both sides with regard to individual matters under discussion, substantial divergences became manifest and further efforts will in time be needed to reach the necessary agreement on a solution of the above problems.

Nevertheless, a continuation of the existing state of Soviet-American relations cannot further the settlement of unsolved international problems. At the same time an improvement in Soviet-American relations that would satisfy our peoples' longings for the furthering of friendly relations between our countries might create a new international atmosphere favorable to the settlement of controversial questions by means of negotiations on a mutually acceptable basis.

It is impossible not to see that a practical solution of the problem of a further lessening of international tension and strengthening of confidence between States, including the improvement of Soviet-American relations, is in the interest of both the Soviet and the American peoples as well as of all other nations.

I believe that you, Mr. President, will agree that under existing conditions international tension is fraught with the possibility of breaking the peace, with nations reaping all the dangerous consequences thereof.

Moreover, it is well known to everyone that the newest implements of war, such as atomic and hydrogen weapons, various instruments of present-day jet and rocket techniques, as well as other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, place the peoples of all countries in an equally dangerous situation in the event that international peace is disturbed, threatening to subject their territories and, above all, densely populated districts of highly developed countries to the devastating effects of atomic war.

At the present time more than ever, it is the duty of each State to be concerned with the maintenance and strengthening of peace, the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means alone, in harmony with the aims and principles of the United Nations.

There can be no doubt that the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States of America are equally interested in putting an end to the armaments race, which forces them to waste their strength and resources for unproductive purposes. The existing armaments race not only saddles nations with a heavy burden of military expenditures and thereby creates obstacles to the promotion of their material welfare, but also greatly intensifies the danger of a new war.

The improvement of Soviet-American relations would lighten the task of putting an end to the armaments race and would contribute to a fuller utilization of the economic resources of States in the interest of peace. In this case the resources now going into unproductive military expenditures could be used for purposes of improving the material well-being of nations, lowering taxes, raising real wages, housing and public construction, aiding underdeveloped countries in the interest of peace, and of strengthening international cooperation.

All of this would contribute considerably toward the

expansion of the domestic market as well as the furtherance of international trade and would moreover ensure a corresponding increase in production and in employment of the population on the basis of an expansion of the peace economy.

The fact should be recognized that events have recently taken place the positive significance of which could not fail to be reflected in the over-all international situation. The past year was one in which no war was being waged in any part of the world. Recently certain complicated international problems that had remained unsolved after the end of the Second World War have been settled.

For the first time since the last war, a meeting of the Heads of Government of the Four Powers was held in Geneva, and the results achieved by us at that meeting were genuinely and fervently welcomed by the peoples of the entire world as corresponding to their aspirations and hopes.

Recently an improvement has been noted in contacts between countries of the East and West, particularly between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, although it is still far from possible to consider such contacts as broad and adequate. As for the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., these expanded contacts have shown how great are the longings of the peoples of our two countries for the further development of such contacts and of friendly cooperation.

In all these important international events, in which the Soviet Union has been advocating a stronger peace and friendship among nations, the results achieved have to a considerable extent been due to the cooperation that has taken place between our countries.

I am genuinely convinced that an improvement in Soviet-American relations is urgently needed.

In my opinion this purpose could be served by the conclusion of a treaty of friendship and cooperation between our countries.

Such a treaty could make provision for the parties, in a spirit of genuine cooperation and mutual understanding, to develop and strengthen the friendly relations between the people of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. on the basis of the principle of equal rights, mutual respect for State sovereignty, and noninterference in internal affairs, and to settle all their international disputes, in accordance with the provisions of the U.N. Charter, by peaceful means alone.

The treaty might also provide for the agreement of the parties to cooperate in developing and strengthening economic, cultural, and scientific cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., based on the principle of mutual advantage and equality of rights.

My colleagues and I feel that the conclusion of such a treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States of America would be an important contribution to the development of Soviet-American relations and at the same time an act of great international significance.

I firmly believe that the proposal concerning the conclusion of a treaty of friendship and cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. for the improvement of Soviet-American relations in the interest of strengthening peace and for the further lessening of international tension

will be favorably received by you and will evoke a positive response from the Soviet and American peoples, as well as from those of other countries.

It is my opinion that the spirit of the treaty which I propose is embodied in the draft enclosed herewith.

I trust that I may soon receive an expression of Your Excellency's thoughts on this subject.

Respectfully,

N. BULGANIN

His Excellency

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

*President of the United States of America
Washington, D.C.*

Soviet Draft Treaty

A TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the President of the United States of America,

Inspired by a desire for a further lessening of international tension and for the establishment of trust between States and acting in the interest of maintaining world-wide peace and security,

Being desirous of strengthening the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States of America,

Being convinced that a strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on the basis of the principles of equal rights, mutual respect for State sovereignty, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs, conforms to the vital interests of both countries,

Asserting their faith in the aims and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to cooperate and live in peace with all peoples and with all governments,

Have resolved to conclude the present Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation and have designated as their plenipotentiary representatives:

For the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics _____

For the President of the United States of America _____, who having communicated to each other their full powers, which have been found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Contracting Parties will develop and strengthen, in the spirit of sincere cooperation and mutual understanding, friendly relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the United States of America on the basis of equal rights, mutual respect for State sovereignty, and noninterference in internal affairs.

ARTICLE II

The Contracting Parties have agreed, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to settle all their international disputes by peaceful means.

ARTICLE III

The Contracting Parties will contribute to the development and strengthening of economic, cultural and scientific cooperation between the two States, on the basis of the principle of mutual benefit and equal rights.

To implement the present Article, appropriate agreements may be concluded between the Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE IV

The present Treaty shall be subject to ratification. It shall become effective on the date of exchange of instruments of ratification which is to take place in the City of _____ in the shortest possible time.

The Treaty shall be valid for 20 years from the date of its coming into force. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid period each of the Contracting Parties shall have the right to denounce it. Such denunciation shall become effective one year from the date on which notice thereof is given.

In witness whereof, the Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty and have affixed their seals thereto.

Done at _____ on _____ 1956, in two copies in the Russian and English languages, both texts being equally authentic.

By authority of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

By authority of the President of the United States of America

Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference

Press release 41 dated January 24

Secretary Dulles: I have no prepared statement to make today, so if there are any questions I would be glad to receive them.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the State Department statement on the Geneva talks on Saturday¹ said that the United States had proposed that both sides renounce the use of force in order to remove the threat of war from those negotiations. In a statement just released by the Chinese Communist Foreign Ministry, they say that the failure to reach agreement does not mean there is a war threat, and they also charge the United States as being guilty of deliberate procrastination and obstruction at the talks. What is your reaction to these latest charges?

A. The statement which we gave out on Saturday gives a pretty full narrative of events and contains all of the relevant documents, and I think

¹ BULLETIN of Jan. 30, 1956, p. 164.

it pretty much speaks for itself. I do not think it indicates any obstructing or procrastinating tactics—on the part of the United States at least. One can wonder sometimes at the Chinese Communist estimate of time. They said, at first, that the Americans detained in China would be “expeditiously” released. Well, most of them have still not been released, after several months. So that is, perhaps, some sidelight as to their own ideas as to what is “expeditious.”

I think the record, as made public, indicates a very sincere desire on our part to get as rapidly as possible to a meaningful understanding with reference to the renunciation of force. As indicated there, some progress has been made. Negotiations with the Chinese Communists are usually slow and prolonged, as we know from past experience. But we are planning to go ahead. The talks are still going on. There is another one scheduled for tomorrow, and we continue to be patient and persistent in our effort to obtain a greater assurance of peace, and renunciation of force, in that area.

U.S.—British Talks

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you specify for us, in broad general terms, the subjects which you expect will be discussed with the British delegation in the conference next week?

A. Well, I could not give any detailed specification. The talks are designed to be of a general character. There are no specific agreements that are on the agenda to be reached, and I imagine that our talks will cover the different parts of the world where our two countries have interests in common and where they can appropriately be discussed without any impropriety as regards other countries who may also be involved. But there are quite a few of those matters, and I imagine most of them will be discussed.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there is a report that Marshal Tito has agreed to let the Czech arms purchased by Egypt pass through Yugoslavia. Do you think this is a contribution to peace in the Middle East?

A. Well, you raise a kind of double-headed question—first, whether the shipment of arms to Egypt is in the interests of peace. We have always felt that it would not be in the interests of peace to have an arms race in that part of the world. That position was made clear as far back as the declara-

tion of May 1950²—I think it was—when the position of the United States and the United Kingdom and France was made clear on that point. We still adhere basically to the principles of that 1950 declaration, which, I think, made quite clear that we think that the uncontrolled and large-scale shipment of arms into that area to one side or the other is not a contribution to peace.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in relation to the tripartite agreement that you mentioned, there have been some reports—in the preliminary discussions for the Eden visit—or suggestions of some new agreement to implement that in case war broke out in the Middle East. Is that a likely possibility for this meeting—either between the United States and the United Kingdom, or later on a tripartite basis?

A. Well, that declaration, you recall, indicated that if there were aggression by either side the three countries who were parties to that declaration would take appropriate action within or without the United Nations. And it would be quite possible, I would think, even probable, that that general topic would be discussed, although, of course, France is also a party to that declaration, and anything that we discussed there would also have to be discussed with the French.

Q. Well, is our first reliance the United Nations in such a case? Is that the general position of the United States?

A. Yes. I would think that, if it is at all practicable, we would seek action through the United Nations, or at least explore and try to exhaust the possibilities of action in the United Nations, before we took individual or independent action. Whether or not United Nations action would be feasible is, of course, a somewhat difficult question in view of the present attitude of the Soviet Union, which is on the Security Council and which has veto power there. But certainly we would in the first instance consider, I believe, the possibility of action through the United Nations.

Q. Mr. Secretary, both Senators Knowland and Bridges have indicated that they will oppose the nomination of Mr. Bowie as Assistant Secretary of State. Is there any plan to withdraw that nomination?

² For text, see *ibid.*, June 15, 1953, p. 834 (footnote).

A. There is no plan to withdraw the nomination. The nomination is pending now before the Senate, and it has been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Q. They say that they had an agreement that appointments in advance would be cleared with them before they were publicly announced. Is that true?

A. Well, I think the usual, normal procedures were followed in this case. You may recall that Mr. Bowie is now Assistant Secretary of State. He was appointed by the President, as an interim appointment, last August,³ I think, after the new assistant secretaryship positions were created, and it was made clear to the Congress at that time that one of those positions was being created for Mr. Bowie. That appears explicitly in the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee.⁴

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you say what action the three powers could take if the Security Council took no action on the matter of the Middle East?

A. No. I don't think I could properly go into that.

Middle East Arms Situation

Q. Mr. Secretary, in connection with that, have you any information, sir, that Tito during his recent visit to Egypt agreed to supply Egypt with arms?

A. No, I have had no intimation to that effect. You recall that the United States has supplied a certain amount of arms to Yugoslavia, but in accordance with our standard procedure in those matters, and, indeed, in accordance with the law, it is stipulated there that the arms could not be retransferred to a third party without our consent.

Q. Why I asked that question, sir, is that I had heard yesterday over at the Pentagon that there is information to the effect that Tito did agree to supply certain arms to Egypt.

A. Well, all I can say is that I have no such indication.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you have any information as to whether we know if Tito has agreed to allow the transshipment of arms through his country?

³ *Ibid.*, Sept. 12, 1955, p. 442; see also White House press release dated Aug. 11.

⁴ H. Rept. 1260, 84th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3.

A. No, I have no official knowledge of that.

Q. Mr. Secretary, can you give us some information on the status of Israel's application for arms to balance the shipment of Communist arms to Egypt?

A. The application is still pending here with the State Department. I shall probably be seeing the Israeli Ambassador during the course of the next few days to talk further about the matter.

Long-Term Foreign Aid

Q. Mr. Secretary, after your talks with congressional leaders are you optimistic on your chances for a long-term foreign aid program?

A. I believe that we will get from the Congress the authority to do the necessary—what we deem to be the necessary things in relation to foreign aid, including an ability to undertake some long-range projects. I do not think that I would want to forecast the precise form which that would take. There are, of course, many possible forms which it could take, and from the legislative standpoint there are a number of choices to be made, and I do not now want to indicate any particular choice.

You may recall that last year, for example, we had this request for a \$200 million fund particularly for what was called the "arc of Asia." There the Congress authorized the full \$200 million, appropriated for that year \$100 million, and we expect to get the second appropriation to fill out the authorization this year. That is one illustration of the way in which these things can be done. There are other ways.

Q. Mr. Secretary, does the administration intend to submit specific proposals on how it believes this problem should be met—the long-term aid program?

A. You mean specific suggestions as to projects?

Q. No, specific suggestions as to the legislation it wants, including the number of years it thinks should be the maximum for such projects and, perhaps, the amount of money involved per year.

A. Yes, I expect that we shall do that. It is probable, although not certain, that that will be expressed in a Presidential message which, in due course, will go up on this subject of the mutual security program.

It has been customary in the past to have a

Presidential message on that subject, which would elaborate somewhat the broad outlines that are contained in the President's state of the Union message. I imagine that that practice may be followed this year, and, if so, that could elaborate the program along the lines you suggested.

Q. Wouldn't that put it in a precise form, which you said you wouldn't now indicate?

A. I was asked whether I thought we would get the authority that we needed to carry forward a limited number of specific projects on a somewhat long-range basis. I said that I thought we would get that authority in some form or another.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there is an idea in what you say. I wonder whether you would say if this is correct: that between now and the time the message goes up you hope to work out with congressional leaders some understanding as to the form and content which would be acceptable there.

A. That is very true. We are having talks of that sort. The whole topic has been discussed already twice before the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees: first, in a rather general way by myself; subsequently, by Mr. Hoover. In addition, I have had talks with Senator George and Congressman Richards, each of whom had lunch with me. We are exploring the different points of view and have good expectation that they will be brought together in some form, although, as I say, I would not want to predict today either the form in which we would ask for the authority or the form in which I think the authority may be given.

Tests of Nuclear Weapons

Q. Mr. Secretary, going back to the question of the Eden visit, the British have been talking about seeking a world agreement under which there would be control, as distinct from banning, of future tests of hydrogen or atomic weapons. Have they discussed that with us, or are we in any way willing to enter into any control system in the field of testing of these weapons?

A. We have had talks on that general subject with the United Kingdom over a considerable period of time. I had the first talks I think somewhere around 2 years ago with Sir Anthony Eden when he was Foreign Minister, and we have been in frequent consultation with each other on that particular subject. I would say that the obstacles

in the path are what we both recognize to be technical difficulties relating to control, and as to where you draw the line between what is a new and bigger explosion and what has now become almost a conventional weapon. There are a great many technical difficulties in the way of formulating a proposal which might be put to the Soviet, in a form which would really be protective of the interests of both sides.

Now we have been discussing that thing with the British off and on for a couple of years. I wouldn't be surprised if it would come up again when Sir Anthony is here this time.

Q. There is no specific proposal before you, however?

A. No, there is not.

Q. Mr. Secretary, are these technical difficulties of the kind you think might be overcome so that a specific proposal might be advanced by us and the British?

A. This is out of my field. It is primarily up to the scientists and the experts and the Atomic Energy Commission to judge that. I would say that as far as my observation goes I do not myself see on the horizon any formula which it seems to me would be likely to work, but, as I say, this is at this stage very largely a matter for the scientists.

Talks With Chinese Communists

Q. Mr. Secretary, referring again to the current exchange of statements between this Capital and Peking, would you say that this counter battery-fire has put an end to the negotiations at Geneva, or do you expect them to continue and to continue fruitfully?

A. Well, I expect them to continue. As I said, there is a meeting set for tomorrow, and I hope and believe that the talks will continue to go on. How fruitful they will be is something on which it is very difficult to form an opinion. Obviously, we would not be continuing the talks unless we had some hopes and expectations of positive results coming out of them.

Q. Would you give us your estimate or guess as to why the Chinese chose to break secrecy in this matter?

A. Well, it has been rather traditional in these matters that when they think they have what they

consider a good propaganda position then they break the general understanding about secrecy. I would not want to say that this was bad faith on their part, because they gave us notice in advance that they did intend to make these things public. We had agreed that the talks would be more apt to make good progress if we did not turn them into a propaganda struggle. But we did not have any absolute hard and fast rule that nothing could under any circumstances be given out, and they did give us advance notice of their intention to do this. Therefore I do not accuse them in that particular respect of having technically been guilty of bad faith. I think it was a step which, because it was designed as a propaganda move, is not in the best interests of getting good results.

You ask why they did it. As I say, I can only assume that they did it because they thought their statement would have a propaganda value for them.

Q. Mr. Secretary, to get back to Yugoslavia, has there been any slackening of U.S. military aid shipments to Yugoslavia?

A. I doubt whether I can answer that question except in a very general way, which is that I believe that the bulk of the program has already been carried out and that what is now going forward is normally on a reduced basis, as against what formerly was the case. If there is anything more than that, I don't know.

Q. Mr. Secretary, a report by a study commission of the House Foreign Affairs Committee published on Friday suggested that, since the Czech-Egyptian deal was a proof of Soviet insincerity, the Geneva conference should have been postponed. Would you care to comment on that?

A. Well, I think that the facts perhaps speak for themselves; namely, we did hold the Geneva conference—I assume you are referring now to the October–November conference?

Q. That is right.

A. Well, if we had thought that it should be postponed, we wouldn't have held it.

Foreign Policy and Political Partisanship

Q. Mr. Secretary, after your talk with Senator George, what do you think the prospects are that

foreign policy will be kept out of the political arena during the forthcoming campaign?

A. Did you say “will be” kept out?

Q. Yes.

(Laughter)

Q. “Might be,” if you wish.

(Laughter)

A. I think perhaps the laughter you have heard is more eloquent than any statement of mine.

Q. Sir, in connection with that last statement may I ask you, on the 13th of January, 1953, you were commenting to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this matter of politics and what is proper to say in a campaign year.

A. Excuse me, I missed the date.

Q. The date was January 13, 1953, and in your statement of that date you said that it is a part of our normal political system and a proper part, of which you approved, for people to take sides in statement of cases, and you said that in a campaign one does use extravagant terms which would not be used in a more judicious context. Now, do you still subscribe to that theory that it is proper in a campaign year to put aside a more judicial attitude for public affairs?

A. I don't recall my precise words. If I was describing the fact that in a political year there is a less judicial attitude, that is, I am afraid, a fact for which much evidence could be adduced. As far as the propriety of discussion, I think I said here a couple of months or so ago, on that topic, that I believe that it is entirely proper and appropriate that there should be what I think I called a constructive discussion of foreign policy.

I would say this, that there is a danger point which I think all patriotic citizens should observe, and that is to not shake confidence abroad in the solidity of the U.S. position on these basic matters. We do have a basically bipartisan position which has evolved over the last 10 years, which involves the committal of the U.S. prestige and honor to various other countries and various places in the world. If there should grow up any doubt about our determination to stand on those commitments, it would be a very sad day for the United States and in my opinion would greatly increase the risk of war.

I think that most people who are active in this

campaign are fully conscious of that fact and, I hope and believe, will take it into account in what they say.

Q. Have you made any efforts, sir, to get matters in this area which you have defined taken out of partisan discussion this year by agreement or common understanding? Is this the sort of thing which you talked to Senator George about, for example?

A. No. We have discussed the possibility of taking one or two matters out of partisanship. It is very difficult to catalog those things. I recall that my first experience in these matters was back in 1944, when I came down here on behalf of Governor Dewey, the Republican candidate, to confer with Secretary Hull on behalf of President Roosevelt, and we had quite a discussion here. We agreed to try to keep one topic out of the discussion, and that was the broad committal of the United States to join in a world organization for peace, which became the United Nations. We tried to get a broader agreement, and Secretary Hull and I discussed it during the greater part of 3 days. Secretary Hull was very anxious to have a broader agreement, but we did not arrive at any formula. Secretary Hull said at the time, the value of those talks would depend upon the outcome. I think he also indicated, when he wrote his memoirs, that the outcome had been satisfactory. But it was because of what I would consider a broad patriotic attitude on both sides rather than by having arrived at a particular formula which cataloged matters. We did, as I say, take the one matter out, and that was the United Nations, but we could not agree on anything else.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what are the one or two matters which you believe should now be kept out of partisanship?

A. Well, I think I would prefer not to define those at the present time, because what we are trying to do would require an understanding on both sides, and until there is, or unless there is such an understanding, I wouldn't want to talk about them.

Q. Well, are you going to continue discussions with the Democratic leaders with a view to keeping some specific subjects out of partisanship?

A. Well, I will continue, of course, to have talks primarily with the two Democrats who

are the chairmen of the Foreign Relations and the Foreign Affairs Committees. Most of our problems, as far as Congress is concerned, focus up to those two men. Now, when you get outside of Congress, the problem is much more difficult to deal with, because one does not know yet who the Democratic candidate for the Presidency is going to be. There are several open or unavowed candidates. And the problem of reaching any agreement becomes pretty difficult when you get outside of the congressional area.

Caracas Doctrine

Q. Mr. Secretary, when the fact of the Communist arms deal with Egypt became generally known, some officials of the Government, of our Government, privately at least expressed a good deal of concern about the danger of Soviet attempts to penetrate Latin America in a similar way or economically. The other day there was a statement, I think it was attributed to Bulganin, that indeed they were inviting new ties, diplomatic, political, and economic, with Latin America. I may have overlooked it, but I haven't seen any particular reaction officially from us on this. Does this mean that we think that things in Latin America are in extremely good shape and that there isn't any particular threat at this time?

A. Well, we never take things for granted, because I feel that if you ever become complacent about any situation that in itself makes an area of danger. The interview that you refer to, the statement that you refer to, was issued as a prospective interview, I think, with the representative of a paper which is widely published or circulated in South America. It is my impression that the paper did not publish the interview, at that time at least, because they feared that it was primarily a propaganda move which they did not care to lend themselves to. So it was published on a unilateral basis by Chairman Bulganin.

Now, I think that there is, of course, a potential danger in Latin America, just as there is in most of the countries of the world. I think that the danger is more under control in that area than in most. This is largely due to the acceptance by the American Republics of what I call the Caracas Doctrine. We agreed at Caracas at the conference of the American States that, if international communism got control of the political institutions of any American state, that would

be a danger to the peace of the entire hemisphere, including the other states, and become a matter of general concern.⁵ Now, it was largely that doctrine which I think led to the overthrow of the Communist regime in Guatemala. It creates a very serious hazard to, and somewhat, I believe, slows down, the efforts of the Communists in this hemisphere. So, while we don't take it for granted by any means that there is no danger, we think we are fairly well organized to cope with the danger.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on that same subject, what is your own thought as to whether or not subversion short of taking over a government would invoke the Monroe Doctrine?

A. Well, I would not think one would go beyond the principles that were accepted in the Caracas resolution which deal with the situation which would exist if in fact international communism got control of the political institution of an American state. Now, there was also in that resolution a provision which is to some degree being helpfully implemented at the present time—that is, that there would be an exchange of information as between the American States so that each would know the activities of international communism insofar as relevant for its own purposes. If, for example, state “A” knew that there was a cell within its state which was contemplating activities as against a second state, the second state would be informed. That kind of thing provides for a multilateral defense against subversion, although the full impact of the Caracas resolution only applies to the eradication of international communism by international effort when it gets control of the political institutions of some American state.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you still consider that the vital interests of this country and of the Western World are involved in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu? I would like to know whether you consider whether it is a matter of unilateral American action or whether you plan to discuss the matter with the British next week or some other time.

A. I gave an answer to a Quemoy-Matsu question last week⁶ and I don't care to add to it this week.

⁵ BULLETIN of Apr. 26, 1954, p. 638.

⁶ Ibid., Jan. 30, 1956, p. 155.

Q. Mr. Secretary, with respect to a question that came up earlier with regard to limitation of or control of atomic or hydrogen tests, does the U.S. Government have a fixed policy or an official attitude toward this, so that it would like to see such control established? Has there ever been any contact with the Soviet Government on this point?

A. No.

Q. “No” to both parts, to both questions?

A. Oh, excuse me. There has been no contact with the Soviet Union on this subject and there has been no policy, you might say, arrived at pending technical advice which indicates the premises upon which policy could be based.

Q. May I ask just one more question on this? As I understand it, the problem is whether some formula could be found before the number of tests, the size of tests, and other limits could be fixed. Is that it?

A. I would not like to be understood as giving a technically, scientifically accurate description of the problem, because it is in fact much too complex for me to understand. I am not a scientist or engineer, I have never studied in that field, and the whole thing is very much a mystery to me. All I can say is that my impression of what I have been told on this subject is that there are very great technical difficulties in arriving, let us say, at a definition of just where you draw the line, for example, between tests that are permissible and tests that are impermissible, or whether it is possible to draw and police a line. And, well, that is only giving you a vague idea. There are many other aspects of the problem which I am not competent really to go into. But that is the type of problem which we have been studying.

Q. Could I turn it around? What was the purpose—what would be the purpose of the conversation when this matter comes up here with Mr. Eden and Mr. Lloyd?

A. Well, let me say if it comes up—I don't know that it will, but it was touched on, I think, in the speech that Sir Anthony made last week, Saturday perhaps, and it is only from that I surmise that it may come up here for discussion. If you will read that speech, you will know as much as I do about what is likely to come up.

Q. Mr. Secretary, will your discussions with

Sir Anthony or the President's discussions with Sir Anthony Eden contain any reference to the problems of German reunification?

A. Well, that is an international problem which is discussed, I think, whenever two or more people

get together who are interested in international justice and in the problems that we have before us. We are all committed to that goal, to do everything that we can to pursue it, and I would be surprised if it did not come up for discussion when Sir Anthony was here.

A Historical View of American Foreign Policy in the Middle East

by Donald R. Heath
Ambassador to Lebanon¹

First of all, let me attempt a general statement of our policy, which is a clear and consistent one, aiming at the maintenance of friendly relations with the peoples and nations of the Middle East, and the support of their independence and their progress.

American interest in the Middle East is almost as old as the United States itself. We Americans are grateful heirs of the culture, the science, the religious and philosophical concepts which in past golden ages this region has so richly produced. We are following with intense interest the renaissance in all fields of human endeavor which is today taking place throughout the Middle East. Our first material interest and appearance on the Middle Eastern scene was maritime. The first decades of our national history were marked by a remarkable expansion of American shipping—the clipper-ship era. Our clipper ships were seen in the harbors of Smyrna, Beirut, North Africa, Mocha, Zanzibar, and Muscat. This was a fine and colorful trade with advantage to all concerned, marked by such dramatic episodes as the war with the Barbary pirates and resulting in some of our earliest treaties. We concluded, for example, a treaty with the Sultan of Morocco in 1789.

With the decline of the clipper ships and their replacement by steam, our formerly brisk trade tended to decline, but its decline coincided with the opening of a new and glorious—I use the word

“glorious” advisedly—stage of American relations with the Middle East. That was the era of American missionaries, American educators, and American philanthropists which left such helpful and enduring monuments as Robert College, the American University in Beirut, and numerous other institutions.

It may be argued that our missionary, philanthropic, and educational activities in the Middle East do not enter into a discussion of American policy toward that region since they were carried on by private individuals and organizations. But, if they were not fostered or financed by our Government, they had the sympathetic approval of the Government and the approval and support of a great body of the American public. These private efforts are being carried on today on an expanding scale by American individuals and organizations. These activities are now supplemented by United States Government aid programs, but the spirit of these latter programs is imbued with essentially the same enlightened benevolence.

The close of the First World War opened a new and hopeful chapter in the long history of this region and inaugurated a new phase of American relations with the old states and the new states which came into being following the war. A conspicuous American activity which began between the two wars was in the development of the petroleum resources of the Near East. I have no desire to read a brief for the oil companies, but neither they nor we need be ashamed of their contribution. They contributed know-

¹Address made before the American Friends of the Middle East at New York, N.Y., on Jan. 26 (press release 42 dated Jan. 25).

how and capital, invested on terms which were generally accepted as fair by the states involved, and their operations have contributed great and increasing financial sinews for the hopeful renaissance which is occurring in the Middle East.

World War II resulted, as did World War I, in a changed picture in the Middle East. New states have arisen in the area, and the independence of others has been confirmed and strengthened as colonialism has tended to disappear or evolve. That process is not complete, but the end is surely almost within human view.

New Threat of Imperialism

The present is a period of great human hopes for the area, but against the realization of these human hopes is a new threat of imperialism dressed in a new garb. I refer to the menace of international communism. I am not going to expound on the nature and aims of international communism. It pretends to have as a goal the betterment of the lot of mankind. Similar arguments were put forth by proponents of unregenerate colonialism of a certain type, but, viewed against their actual and the total record, the Communist claims are even more fallacious. We have hopes—and they are not unfounded—that in the atomic age into which we are entering Communist imperialism can be restrained and perhaps, as a result of such restraint, can be denatured. But meanwhile it is today, with great and increasing energy, endeavoring to extend its thralldom over the great and promising area of the Middle East. It is not, as of today, using the threat of force or actual force as it did respectively in Turkey and Iran immediately after World War II. It is using what has been called by our Secretary of State a "Trojan horse policy" of subversion, masked by offers of economic and arms aid.

The new development in American policy toward the Middle East which followed World War II was our coming to the support, I might say to the defense, of countries such as Turkey and Iran, immediately threatened by Soviet force. We followed it with arms and economic assistance to Middle Eastern countries directly in the shadow of would-be Soviet expansionism. We have since followed it with economic aid programs to countries who are not in the first line of possible Soviet military advance. It is idle to deny that one powerful motive behind these new programs of Amer-

ican governmental aid was the desire to halt the advance of Soviet tyranny. But that is not the whole story. Essential in our aid programs and in the support given them by the American public is the desire to alleviate human suffering and to promote human progress.

Emergence of Israel

In this sketchy review of American policy toward the Middle East I have left for last mention the occurrence which without doubt most perturbs that region—that is, the emergence of Israel in 1947 as an independent state, the war between Israel and her Arab neighbors, and the uneasy armistice and human fears and suffering and, I must add, the hatreds which followed that war. American support for Israel has often been misinterpreted, and it would be folly for us to overlook the effect that the Arab-Israel dispute has had on the attitude of many Arabs toward the U.S.

The factors which brought about the creation of the State of Israel are well known. They include such things as the horror aroused by the Nazi slaughter of millions of Jews in Europe and sympathy for the efforts of the survivors—a minority—to find a haven in which to rebuild their shattered lives. At the same time our Government is deeply aware of the tragic plight of the Palestinian refugees who fled the battlegrounds of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Last August Secretary Dulles, in a speech delivered in this city,² set forth the earnest desire of the United States and specifically of our President to offer our help, financial and moral, toward a just and equitable solution of that problem. That desire exists today and, with it, the conviction that, in spite of its complexities and suffering, a just and equitable solution can be found. It is urgent that a solution be found so that the peoples of the region can devote their full efforts toward the great human progress which could be achieved there within less than the span of a human life. I believe it is unnecessary to repeat the Secretary's analysis, the general proposals and offers of financial and other assistance toward the solution of that problem. It is a problem which is receiving the most earnest and continuing study by the President, the State Department, and other branches of the Government.

² BULLETIN of Sept. 5, 1955, p. 378.

One of the hopeful developments in this time of troubles in which we live is the increasing if as yet imperfect realization in the United States and in the free world that in the long run the relations between nations are subject to moral law. I might term this law the golden rule of international relations and would define it by the proposition that if a policy or action by one state is harmful to the long-term interests of another nation then it is not to the true advantage of the state committing the action. I believe that the Soviet Union will eventually discover that its transgression of this law has done dire injury to the true interests of Russia.

I hope that in negotiations that we trust will before long take place between the Arab nations involved and the State of Israel this golden rule will be kept constantly in mind in order that a just and lasting settlement may be achieved.

The benevolent interest of the United States in the countries of the Middle East exemplified by the activities of private American philanthropists and educators since more than a century continues and is manifested by the aid programs of our Government inspired by the same sympathy with the aspirations of the Middle Eastern states. Friendship toward the Middle East is a constant in American foreign policy.

U.S. Policy on Treaty Rights in Morocco

Press release 46 dated January 26

It is the policy of the U.S. Government to relinquish its extraterritorial jurisdiction in Morocco at the appropriate time. The Department intends to request congressional action to this end.

These extraterritorial rights were accorded to us in the treaty of peace and friendship first concluded with Morocco in 1787 and renewed in 1836. These rights were subsequently expanded through the effect of other international agreements concluded by Morocco.

The U.S. Government, pleading before the International Court of Justice in 1952 in the case concerning U.S. treaty rights in Morocco,¹ made clear that it had always stood ready and still stood

ready to take steps to relinquish its extraterritorial rights when the circumstances warranted.

The United States is following closely the progress which France and Morocco are making in working out their future relationships. We consider that to modernize our own treaty relationship with Morocco with respect to our extraterritorial rights would be the only course in keeping with this evolution.

Allotment of \$50 Million to India for Economic Development

Approval of \$50 million to India for economic development assistance was announced on January 10 by the International Cooperation Administration. This is the amount authorized for India by Congress from the 1956 mutual security appropriation. The money will augment India's own economic development program.

India has spent more than \$4 billion since the start of its first Five-Year Plan in 1951 to raise the living standard of its 372 million population—the largest of any free-world nation. During this period the United States has allotted the South Asian nation \$274,464,000 in economic aid.

As a result of India's development program, food and raw materials are more nearly adequate than at any time in recent years. During the first 3 years of the Five-Year Plan, per capita income was raised by 8 percent.

The new \$50 million will be applied to India's second Five-Year Plan, which starts April 1, and will bring total U.S. Government economic aid to India to \$324,474,000. This amount is exclusive of a \$190 million wheat loan to India in 1951 and approximately \$21,500,000 in U.S. agricultural commodities distributed in the country by voluntary relief agencies.

The new ICA funds will be used to continue programs such as acquiring steel for railways, fertilizer, DDT for malaria control, grain-storage facilities, and other purposes.

As its own economy has developed, more and more of U.S. economic assistance to India has been in the form of loans rather than grants. In the 1955 program, \$45 million out of a total of \$60,500,000 of U.S. development assistance was in the form of loans. It is expected that at least 75 percent of 1956 development assistance funds will be loans.

¹ For an article on the case, see *BULLETIN* of Oct. 20, 1952, p. 620.

U.S.-Indian Cooperation for Economic Development

by John Sherman Cooper
Ambassador to India¹

I am here on behalf of my Government to turn over these four locomotives to the Government of India as an expression of the good will that the people of the United States hold for the people of India in their great task of building this nation. Tomorrow I will go to Okha in Saurashtra to participate again in ceremonies turning over to India the first of what will eventually number more than 8,700 freight cars—or, as you call them, railway goods wagons.²

I would like the people of India to know that when these four locomotives, manufactured by the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corporation of Eddystone, Pennsylvania, left the shores of the United States a ceremony was held at the dockside by Americans who were proud to see them going to India as a symbol of America's good will. And it is very good of you to receive them today with this ceremony. For these two simple observances, separated by half the circumference of the earth, emphasize the character of American assistance. It is a cooperative undertaking of our Governments, and in essence it expresses a relationship of mutual respect between our peoples. On my part, I am honored that it has fallen to my lot to take part in this ceremony.

India has one of the great railway systems of the world. Its 34,000 miles of track are approximately equivalent in size to such systems as that of Germany, and it is about four-fifths the size of that of Canada. Although the United States railroad system of 222,000 miles is almost seven times that of India, Indian railways carry more passen-

gers than the total of all United States railroads. On the other hand, due to our expanded economic and industrial development, freight carried in the United States is much larger.

It is inevitable that India's expanding economic and rural development will exert a continuing and increasing burden both in terms of freight and passenger carriage on India's railways. This certainty underscores the fact that the success of India's broad economic program depends in large measure upon the parallel development of its railway system. It is a tribute to the foresight of India's leaders, to you of the Ministry of Transport, to the Railway Board, and to all those who direct and operate India's railways that you have recognized the importance of an improved railway system in the expanding economy of India. On our part, I am glad that we of the United States have supported India's objectives in the transportation sector of its first Five-Year Plan. My country made its first major contribution to India's transport in 1954 through our Indo-American program. This was carried on in the year which has just ended and is being continued in this new year.

In this connection may I say that all of the locomotives and freight wagons provided to India under our assistance program are not manufactured in the United States. Half of the 100 locomotives are being fabricated in the United States shops. The others are being made in the United Kingdom and in Japan. Similarly, the freight cars provided to India by America are being manufactured in the United Kingdom, Austria, and France as well as in the United States, and many axles and wheels will be provided by shops in Japan.

¹ Address made at Bombay on Jan. 3.

² For background on U.S. aid to India's railways, see BULLETIN of Jan. 18, 1954, p. 88.

Extent and Purpose of U.S. Aid

I do not want to dwell unduly on American assistance to India, but as you near the end of your first Five-Year Plan and inaugurate the second Five-Year Plan it may be of interest to say something of the extent and purpose of American aid.

The \$38,500,000 which has already been made available for the rehabilitation of Indian railways, as a part of your first Five-Year Plan, is but a portion of the total. Since August 15, 1947—the date of India's independence—United States Government aid to India has totaled \$477,934,000 or, expressed in your own currency, Rs. 227 crores. Of this total more than half—or \$242,934,000—has been in grants and the remainder in the form of loans, chiefly for the delivery of wheat in 1951–52. These figures do not include grants and contributions which have come to India from the American people through such nongovernmental organizations as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and other United States private voluntary agencies. This form of assistance to India since 1947 has totaled an additional \$48,289,000, or about Rs. 23 crores.

I have mentioned these figures not for their own value but because they represent the continuous effort that the American people have made over a period of years and because they thus illustrate in a larger sense the great effort the Indian people themselves have made. For we pay tribute above all to the effort and achievement of the Indian Government and people in building the economy of their country. I have mentioned the 100 locomotives and 8,700 freight cars which are being furnished to the Indian railways through American assistance, but I have not forgotten that during the first Five-Year Plan India has placed orders for more than 2,000 locomotives, to be paid for from Indian resources. We do not forget that it is the effort of the Indian people themselves that is primary and basic. External assistance, from whatever source, can play at most a minor part in the development of a country. Here in India external aid has no meaning apart from the great effort made by your people under the leadership of your President, your Prime Minister, and Government.

Industrial Improvement

Briefly, we have tried to fit our assistance into the frame of India's first and second Five-Year Plans, and the objects to which our aid has been

applied have been approved by the Government of India. They have covered a cross section of industrial, agricultural, and social undertakings. In the field of industrial improvement, the expansion of India's railways which this ceremony emphasizes is a good example. During the past 4 years the people of the United States have also delivered or placed on order for India 660,000 long tons of steel. This does not include the thousands of tons that are represented in the locomotives and railway wagons which have come to India, and I can tell you further that the figure of 660,000 tons that I have quoted will be substantially increased in a few days.

In another field to which India's first Five-Year Plan gave great importance, that of achieving self-sufficiency in agriculture, we have likewise been able to contribute. To date we have provided some \$21 million for fertilizer and some \$23,500,000 for ground water and irrigation. But we hope above all that our technical assistance and funds have contributed to those human and social endeavors which keep and expand life itself—the human fields of health, of education, and of community development. I stress this because I believe that the great opportunity of understanding and agreement between our two countries lies in our common belief in the value of people as individuals and in the spiritual expression of freedom itself.

U.S. Friendship for India

Before I close I would like to say that American economic aid to India is no new thing, just as American friendship for India is no new development on the international scene. Over a decade ago, when the people of India were striving to achieve independence, I am glad that the United States, acting as a friend both of India and the U.K., urged Indian independence. And in the years that have passed, my country has continued to demonstrate the friendship of our people with those of India. As we gave support to India in its aspiration for political independence, my country for over 5 years has done what it could to assist India in its expressed purpose to achieve economic independence and to raise the living standards of its people.

And, finally, may I say that to whatever degree my country's assistance has been of value, its provision has been the choice and decision of all the American people made through the demo-

cratic process of our institutions. As a citizen of the United States and as representative of the President of the United States in your great nation, I thank you for the honor you have done my country by asking its representatives to meet with you today. I look back with you today on the record of constancy and cooperation, and I look forward to a future in which my country desires to continue and increase its friendship with India and its people.

Letters of Credence

James C. Hagerty, press secretary to the President, announced on January 24 that the President had that day received the credentials of the newly appointed Ambassador of Iran, Ali Amini.

Mr. Katzen Appointed Consultant on Use of Funds in Israel

Press release 43 dated January 25

The Secretary of State on January 25 appointed Bernard Katzen as a special consultant on the use of local currencies acquired by the United States in Israel. Mr. Katzen is a New York attorney and a former assistant district attorney and arbitrator of the New York State Labor Mediation Board. He is a member of the American Judicature Society and of the New York State Bar Association.

Mr. Katzen will make recommendations to the Department of State and the United States Information Agency for using funds which have accumulated to the account of the United States through the sale of American publications in Israel under the Informational Media Guaranty program. The Informational Media Guaranty Agreement of June 9, 1952, between the United States and Israel provides that these funds are freely expendable in Israel by the United States for scientific, educational, and cultural activities or for other purposes as mutually agreed between the two countries. In considering and recommending the most effective and productive use of these funds, Mr. Katzen hopes to facilitate a significant U.S. contribution to the existing close cultural relations between this country and Israel.

Mr. Katzen plans to visit Israel in February for several weeks to discuss with officials of the Government of Israel and with various organizations in Israel the most advantageous uses for the funds.

His recommendations are expected to form the basis of a request to the Congress for authorization to use the funds for specific purposes.

SEATO Representatives Prepare for Meeting of Council

Following is the text of a communique issued at Bangkok, Thailand, on January 17 at the close of a meeting of the Council Representatives of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty Organization.

The SEATO Council Representatives today held a further meeting in preparation for the second conference of the SEATO Council of Foreign Ministers which is to be held in Karachi on March 6, 1956.¹ The Council Representatives, who have their headquarters in Bangkok and carry on the business of the treaty organization as directed by the Council of Foreign Ministers, are now engaged in a broad review of SEATO's accomplishments to date. They are examining those accomplishments which have contributed towards the objectives of preserving peace, of strengthening the capacity of the nations of Southeast Asia to defend their independence against aggression and subversion directed from without, and of promoting their economic well-being. This review will be incorporated in a report to be submitted to the Council at Karachi. The report will also contain the Council Representatives' proposals for SEATO activities during the coming year. To obtain expert assistance in this task, the Council Representatives have convened the specialized committees under their jurisdiction to meet in Bangkok this month.

The Committee of Economic Experts, composed of delegates from each of the member nations, met on January 12 and is still in session. It is reviewing the economic problems which confront various member governments, seeking the best means to solve them by self-help and cooperative effort among the eight nations involved.

The Committee on Information, Cultural, Education and Labor activities started its meeting in Bangkok yesterday. It is composed of experts of the member governments and will make

¹For the final communique issued at Bangkok on Feb. 25, 1955, at the close of the first meeting of the Council, see BULLETIN of Mar. 7, 1955, p. 371.

recommendations to improve the cooperative effort of SEATO in these fields.

The Committee to combat Communist subversion is also meeting to consider matters in its sphere.

The recommendations of the Committees will shortly be forwarded to the Council Representatives and, after review, incorporated in their report. The Council Representatives meeting which opened today is under the Chairmanship of Mr. Max W. Bishop, the new United States Ambassador to Thailand, who serves concurrently as SEATO Council Representative for the United States. The Chairmanship rotates on a monthly basis and fell to the United States during January. The other representatives were: Mr. David O. Hay for Australia, Baron Albert de Schoenen for France, Mr. Foss Shanahan for New Zealand, Mr. Syed Khalil-ur-Rehman for Pakistan, Mr. Jose Alejandrino for the Philippines, Luang Bhadravadi for Thailand, Sir Berkeley Gage for the United Kingdom.

U.S. Gives Viet-Nam \$37 Million for Refugee Resettlement

The International Cooperation Administration on January 18 announced approval of a \$37-million program to assist free Viet-Nam in the resettlement of political refugees from the north during the 1956 fiscal year. The basic objective of the program is to assist in the integration of the refugees into Viet-Nam's economy within the shortest possible time.

U.S. aid will be used to provide agricultural tools, seeds, fertilizers, work animals, loan credits to refugees, equipment for the preparation and clearing of land, food distribution, and special educational activities. Some of the refugees will be resettled by the Viet-Nam Government on abandoned land in southwest Viet-Nam. American agricultural experts, who recently cooperated with Viet-Nam Government agricultural technicians in making a survey of this land, reported it to be good land with a high fertility level. The exact acreage of this land to be provided to each refugee family has not yet been decided upon by the Viet-Nam Government.

ICA support for the refugee resettlement program will help Viet-Nam to absorb more than 500,000 civilian refugees who fled from the Com-

munists after July 1954.¹ Provided with the land, tools, and equipment which they need to support themselves, these refugees will be able to contribute to the development of Viet-Nam's economy.

The refugees fled from the Communists when Viet Minh forces obtained control of Viet-Nam north of the 17th parallel. President Eisenhower announced that the United States would assist non-Communists from the north to evacuate and settle in the south. Initially U.S. Navy transports and about \$10 million for tents and relief supplies were made available for this purpose.

When the magnitude of the flow of refugees to the south became evident, an overall refugee program was developed and the expenditure of \$35 million in U.S. aid was authorized. Later, supplementary aid was provided, bringing the total for 1955 to \$55.8 million. These funds were used to help cover transportation costs, reception facilities—including tents and housing materials—food, medical supplies, and temporary subsistence allowances. The French and Vietnamese Governments also contributed to this program for civilian refugees.

In fiscal 1955, \$320 million in U.S. military and economic aid was provided, primarily to help the Vietnamese Government to rehabilitate war-devastated areas and put the country's economy on a stable and eventually self-sufficient basis.

Revised Regulation on Radioisotope Distribution

Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, on January 10 announced issuance of a revised regulation—"Licensing of By-product Material"—which removes certain restrictions on the sale of radioisotopes abroad and simplifies procedures governing domestic distribution.²

The revised regulation sets up procedures by which scientists in other countries may more easily obtain U.S.-produced radioisotopes. It makes more conveniently available to them radioactive materials for use in medicine, agriculture, industry, and the physical sciences. Scientists and research groups in other nations can now deal di-

¹ For a report of the evacuation, see BULLETIN of Feb. 7, 1955, p. 222.

² For text of revised regulation, see 21 *Fed. Reg.* 213.

rectly with production and distribution centers in this country.

In the United States the revised regulation will help American researchers and the growing body of radioisotope users by raising the limit on quantities of radioactive materials available to each user under general license. These increased quantities, while far below those which could cause any danger to the general population, are nevertheless of importance to research and to practical applications of radioisotopes in science and industry.

The revised regulation is effective February 10, 1956. It replaces the existing "Radioisotopes Distribution" regulation, first issued in 1951, governing distribution and use of radioisotopes shipped to distributors and consumers from various AEC installations through the Commission's Isotopes Division in Oak Ridge, Tenn.³

A system of general and specific licenses is established by the new regulation covering distribution of byproduct radioactive materials produced in nuclear reactors. The revision brings the regulation into conformity with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and liberalizes export procedures as announced by Dr. Willard F. Libby of the Commission during the International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva last August.⁴

Foreign Distribution

The revised regulation eliminates a number of administrative steps now required before reactor-produced radioisotopes may be shipped abroad. Except for export to Soviet-bloc countries, Commission licensees in the United States will now be able to ship byproduct materials having an atomic number from 3 to 83, inclusive, directly to persons abroad.

These former requirements are eliminated: (1) appointment by foreign governments of representatives in the United States before users in their countries could obtain radioisotopes from the United States; and (2) reports from foreign representatives, on request, on the results of use of radioactive materials shipped to their countries.

The Commission will keep itself informed as to the kind, quantity, and destination of exports by having U.S. licensees report to the Commis-

sion within 90 days after an export, showing the kind and quantity of isotopes exported, the consignee's name and address, and the date of export.

Provision is made for filing applications for specific licenses to export other byproduct materials and to export byproduct material to Soviet-bloc countries, but the Commission will not issue such licenses if, in its opinion, the proposed export would be inimical to the common defense and security.

Domestic Distribution

The revised regulation lists 65 byproduct materials which may, within specified levels of radioactivity, be possessed under general license, provided that no person shall at any one time possess more than 10 scheduled quantities. The old regulation did not list these byproducts by name, but provided generally for exemption from licensing of beta- or gamma-emitting materials up to a total of 11 microcuries. ("Microcurie" means that amount of radioactive material which disintegrates at the rate of 37,000 atoms per second.) The levels subject to general licensing in the revised regulation generally are somewhat higher than those exempted heretofore.

Marketing of a more effective static eliminator containing polonium-210 is aided. Such eliminators must be manufactured in accordance with Commission-approved specifications contained in the manufacturer's license. A similar provision in the old regulation was confined to eliminators containing not more than 125 microcuries of polonium-210. Under the revised regulation licensed manufacturers may distribute to persons not having specific licenses static eliminators containing up to 500 microcuries of polonium-210.

The revised regulation provides a new category of sealed sources—spark gap and electronic tubes containing not more than 5 microcuries of cesium-137 or nickel-63 per tube, or not more than 1 microcurie of cobalt-60 per tube—which, when manufactured according to the approved specifications, may be distributed to persons not having specific licenses.

In issuing the revised regulation the Commission said that its usual practice of publishing a proposed regulation and inviting comment was not followed because the revisions made are for the most part designed to remove certain present restrictions and to clarify present provisions, and

³ BULLETIN of July 30, 1951, p. 181.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1955, p. 381.

not to impose additional requirements on licensees or applicants. In connection with consideration of further amendments, interested persons may submit written comments and suggestions to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington 25, D.C., attention the Director, Division of Civilian Application.

Ambassador Wadsworth To Represent U.S. in Atomic Agency Negotiations

The Department of State announced on January 26 (press release 45) that Ambassador James J. Wadsworth has been designated as the U.S. Representative for International Atomic Energy Agency Negotiations. The Agency was first proposed by President Eisenhower for developing the peaceful uses of the atom. Ambassador Morehead Patterson conducted these negotiations for the United States until his resignation on November 30, 1955.

Ambassador Wadsworth, who will have offices in the Department of State, will represent the United States at a meeting in Washington of the 12 countries engaged in the preparation of a statute for the International Atomic Energy Agency.¹ This meeting, which was called by the United States, is to begin on February 27.

Ambassador Wadsworth will continue as Deputy Representative of the United States to the United Nations, where he has been serving since his appointment in February 1953. During this time, he has been active at all subsequent sessions of the General Assembly, has served as U.S. Representative at several sessions of the Economic and Social Council, and has been Deputy U.S. Representative on the United Nations Disarmament Commission and on the Disarmament Subcommittee.

U.S. Representatives on WHO Board

The Senate on January 25 confirmed Dr. Frederick J. Brady to be the representative of the

¹ For text of draft statute, see BULLETIN of Oct. 24, 1955, p. 666.

United States on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization. On January 27 President Eisenhower appointed Dr. Charles W. Mayo to be alternate U.S. representative.

Under Secretary Hoover To Visit in Berlin and Bonn

The Department of State announced on January 24 (press release 40) that Under Secretary Hoover will leave on February 2 for a 4-day visit to Germany. On February 5 Mr. Hoover will be the principal speaker at ceremonies in Berlin marking the tenth anniversary of radio station RIAS (Radio in the American Sector). Dr. James B. Conant, U.S. Ambassador to the German Federal Republic, will preside, and it is expected that German Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano and other West German, Berlin, and American officials will participate.

While Mr. Hoover is in Berlin, he will also take part in the dedication of a new vocational high school named in honor of his father, former President Hoover.

On the way to Berlin for these occasions, the Under Secretary will call upon Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Foreign Minister von Brentano at Bonn. He will fly back directly from Berlin to Washington on February 6.

Former Senator Upton Named to Mixed Board at Bonn

The Department of State announced on January 25 (press release 44) that former Senator Robert W. Upton has been appointed as the American member of the Mixed Board sitting at Bonn which deals with matters of clemency and parole for prisoners in German war crimes cases. The Mixed Board, which was established by international agreement, is composed of American, British, French, and German citizens. It is an independent body exercising a quasijudicial function, and its members are not subject to governmental instructions.

Integration of the International Cooperation Administration Within the Department of State

Statement by Secretary Dulles¹

I am glad to have this opportunity to discuss with you the arrangements which we have made in the Department of State, at the direction of the President, for administering the economic aspects of the mutual security program through the International Cooperation Administration.

The basic principles and philosophy governing the relationships between ICA and the rest of the State Department stem from the President's Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953.² The studies which culminated in that plan pointed to three general conclusions:

1. the desirability of consolidating foreign economic and technical-assistance programs under a single person for all areas of the world;
2. the basic difference in method and type of activity between these programs and the traditional foreign-policy responsibilities in the Department of State; and
3. the necessity for effective foreign-policy guidance to these programs by the Secretary of State.

These conclusions were embodied in Reorganization Plan No. 7. These arrangements proved to be very useful and satisfactory in actual operation between 1953 and 1955.

In transferring responsibility for mutual security operations to the Secretary of State, the President recognized the success of these principles which he had established in Reorganization

Plan No. 7 and reaffirmed them for application in the new arrangements he then set up. In his letter to the Secretary, April 15, 1955,³ with respect to this transfer, the President said:

Consistent with this approach we should avoid dispersal of operating responsibilities either within the Department or to agencies outside the Department.

A third objective stated in 1953 was the freeing of the Secretary of State from operating responsibilities so that he, assisted by his Under Secretary, could devote a preponderance of attention to foreign policy. These two important considerations are recognized in the Executive order⁴ which will assign maximum responsibilities to a single key official within the Department of State.

In his message to Congress on the 1955 mutual security program, the President referred further to the new organizational arrangement as follows:

The International Cooperation Administration will be a new semi-autonomous unit within the Department of State. Its director will report directly to the Secretary of State and will, on the Secretary's behalf, give supervision and direction to the mutual security operations performed within the Department of State.

This responsibility will require that the International Cooperation Administration have the capacity to make and carry out operating decisions within broad policy guides established by the Secretary of State. It will likewise require that the Director of the International Cooperation Administration have his own complement of supporting staff and program personnel, both in Washington and in the field. It will be his responsibility to assure that appropriate policy guide lines are secured from the Secretary of State, and within those guide lines he will issue the necessary instructions to the field to carry out its policy.

¹ Made before the Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on Jan. 23 (press release 39).

² BULLETIN of June 15, 1953, p. 852.

³ *Ibid.*, May 2, 1955, p. 715.

⁴ *Ibid.*, May 30, 1955, p. 889.

Basis of Organization Plan

This philosophy of organization was not something pulled out of the blue in 1953. It has a solid basis in past experience. The Department has at various times administered the economic portion of the initial program of aid to Greece and Turkey before it was included in the Marshall plan, and the programs of relief assistance and interim aid to certain European countries which preceded the Marshall plan. However, the Department's most extensive operational experience in the foreign-assistance field was with the technical-assistance program which was administered by the Technical Cooperation Administration from 1950 until 1953.

Initially in the technical cooperation program the Administrator was directed to use existing facilities of the Department and the technical capacities of other Government agencies as much as possible in carrying out the program. This in effect meant using the regional bureaus of the Department for the programing process, the Department's administrative facilities for administrative support, and the technical staffs and facilities of other Government agencies for actual program operations in the field. This decentralized arrangement, in which the TCA Administrator was little more than a coordinator, did not, I understand, prove satisfactory, and it became necessary, in the interests of speeding up the program and making it more effective, to centralize program functions and operations much more fully under the TCA Administrator. This reversal of organizational policy as a result of practical experience took place while TCA was in the Department, a year and a half before its transfer under Reorganization Plan No. 7.

This background and the quotations cited from the President's directives make clear that the success of the new organizational arrangement should not be measured by the extent to which the various offices of the ICA have been integrated with the other offices of the Department of State. In fact, the recent reorganization contemplated continuance of the earlier distinction between mutual security operations and the traditional function of the Department in the conduct of international relations. The new plan provided, of course, that both of these would be directly under the Secretary of State. This arrangement is yielding mutual benefits in the form of closer coordination at the staff and working levels as well as among the top officials.

The Secretary of State is, of course, directly responsible for policy formulation and for policy guidance to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration. In matters of broad application or unusual importance I provide this guidance in discussion with Mr. Hollister—or Mr. Hoover does in my behalf.

After this policy guidance has been given, ICA then undertakes to develop and prepare programs to carry out the decided policies in the most effective way. The development of these programs is closely coordinated with the appropriate Assistant Secretary and members of his staff. However, Mr. Hoover or I make the final review of these programs and of the funds believed needed for them before the programs are presented to the Congress.

The ICA is responsible for the numerous details of implementing programs once they are authorized. However, at this stage also the appropriate Assistant Secretary and his staff work closely with ICA and provide policy guidance as the actual carrying out of the programs unfolds. Here, too, Mr. Hoover or I take any steps necessary to assure that the program continues to be in support of our policy objectives.

We are confident that these arrangements are resulting in greater effectiveness both for ICA program operations and for other activities of the Department.

Parallelism in Organizational Structure

This result is facilitated and liaison at all levels has been enhanced by the general parallelism in organizational structure between ICA and the rest of the Department, which was one of the features of the 1953 reorganization. This parallelism does not constitute duplication or overlapping but is a deliberate arrangement to make coordination easier. For example, ICA has country desks generally paralleling those in the regional bureaus of the Department. Departmental desk officers do not have authority over, or responsibility for, ICA operations in their countries. The ICA country desks are used to develop specific country programs; to oversee the orderly execution of these programs; and to control and expedite ICA programs in the countries involved. The Departmental desks collaborate closely with their ICA colleagues at each major step in the program process to assure that the amount, composition, and timing of the country programs are consistent

with U.S. foreign-policy objectives in the countries concerned. The ICA desks are heavily involved in program operations as well as program formulation, and Departmental desks have many other duties which are not related to ICA work. Both the Departmental and ICA desks have full-time and demanding assignments. For this reason no savings would be anticipated if we combined these desk operations, and responsibility for the two different functions would be seriously confused.

The responsibilities of the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs and of the Director of ICA are also distinct. The Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs is responsible for work involved in developing and establishing the broad foreign economic policy of the U.S. The Director of ICA is responsible for operation of the foreign-assistance programs. Broad economic policy includes, in addition to policy regarding the programs operated by ICA, those areas of trade, transport, financial, and economic policy which are integral parts of our foreign policy for which the Secretary of State is responsible. These activities may be illustrated by the following: reciprocal trade agreements; treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation; bilateral aviation agreements; telecommunications conventions; foreign-policy guidance to United States representatives on the International Bank and State Department participation in Export-Import Bank policies; and cooperation with the Economic and Social Council and the special agencies of the United Nations. These examples serve to indicate the breadth of work involving foreign economic policy which exists irrespective of aid programs.

The work of the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs and of the Director of ICA are closely related, of course, since the foreign economic policy of the United States is one of the guiding factors within which ICA accomplishes its work. Similarly, the ICA Director quite naturally develops special knowledge, judgments, and points of view about questions of foreign economic policy. His observations on these matters are very useful to the Secretary, to the Under Secretary, and to the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. There is a need for mutual consultation between ICA and the Department's Bureau of Economic Affairs on applicability of general policy considerations in individual cases, and while there is a full and complete interchange

between the Director of ICA and the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, therefore, and between their staffs, each of them has separate responsibilities.

Administrative and Housekeeping Operations

The same principles apply to the administrative and housekeeping operations of ICA and the Department of State. For example, ICA still has a separate budget office, a separate personnel office and security system. These are not evidences of overlapping or duplication, since in each case these administrative activities are necessary and integral adjuncts to the performance of the basic and different ICA and State Department functions. Approximately the same number of personnel would be required, regardless of whether the offices are merged or maintained under their respective organizations. We have, however, established much closer coordination between the officials responsible for these functions and are currently examining the functions as performed by both agencies to see how we can coordinate them better. Under Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953 we had already effected integration of some housekeeping functions. For example, within FOA we had consolidated three general counsels into one, four budget offices into one, and two personnel offices into one. To consolidate housekeeping functions further, however, would very likely save no money and would inevitably confuse responsibility for mutual security operations with those of the other offices of the Department. Further, there should be noted in the excerpt above from the President's message to Congress his reference to the requirement "that the Director of the International Cooperation Administration have his own complement of supporting staff and program personnel, both in Washington and in the field."

Since ICA has been in the Department, although a separate unit therein, the Director of ICA and senior officials of the Department have initiated a series of specific investigations and studies to improve work coordination and eliminate possible overlapping. As one result of these studies, for example, it has been decided to abolish five ICA missions in Western Europe and to combine the remaining work of ICA with the embassy economic sections. It is anticipated that this development will occur in other countries as aid diminishes.

Plans are also under way to coordinate ICA activities in Latin America more closely with the embassies there. We have also increased direct daily coordination in Washington through such devices as fuller exchange of personnel between staff meetings of ICA and other offices of the Department. A number of joint working groups have recently studied possibilities for improved coordination and closer liaison in administrative and staff service functions, and similar studies are under way in the policy and program areas. We are proceeding, therefore, to take full advantage of Ica's location in the Department to improve coordination and eliminate any actual duplication.

Since the transfer into the State Department of responsibilities relating to the mutual security program, we have continued to carry out operations abroad under the same pattern of relationships as had been provided by Executive order for several years. This pattern provides for communications between the Ica headquarters and Ica mission chiefs in the field through the communications facilities of the State Department. The ambassador is kept fully informed of these communications in order to assist him in discharging his responsibility for general direction and leadership of the entire U.S. effort within the country. The ambassador is responsible for assuring a cooperative country-team operation and for assuring that annual program plans, negotiations with the local government, and all other matters of political importance are treated in accordance with our foreign policy and in the best interest of our relations with the local government.

This basic scheme has worked well in most countries, but we are now obtaining a review of field arrangements by a group of State and Ica officers who are thoroughly experienced with these matters in the field. This review will undoubtedly lead to some adjustments, although it seems likely that no rigid pattern of further integration would be uniformly applicable to all countries. Variations in the size and character of aid programs and other U.S. problems and U.S. representation may require that any basic plan of field organization be adjusted to local circumstances. In the case of the U.S. operations missions in five European countries which we have already abolished, the embassy counselor for economic affairs has been designated as Ica representative and will super-

vise a combined embassy economic staff and Ica staff. In several other countries the Ica activities and the embassy economic work have been partially or fully combined under common supervision. The current study of these arrangements may indicate the respective local situation in which one or another of these plans would be the best arrangement. There is no evidence that the further integration of State and Ica staffs in the field will produce any substantial economies, although an improvement in operations might result.

In summary, we shall, as a continuing project, make a general effort to improve coordination and eliminate overlapping functions wherever desirable. Although we feel that policy and operations should remain separate in Washington, we are moving toward joint use of staff in the field wherever practicable.

Continuation of Aid to Denmark, U.K., Italy

The International Cooperation Administration announced on January 19 that its Director, John B. Hollister, had on that day notified Congress of a Presidential determination to continue aid under the mutual security program to Denmark, the United Kingdom, and Italy. The Presidential determination is required by the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (the Battle Act) because those countries shipped \$282,977 worth of industrial commodities to European Soviet-bloc countries.

As in some previous cases the shipments by Denmark and the United Kingdom were contracted before the commodities came within the purview of the act. The Italian shipment resulted from an administrative error. None of the shipments included arms, ammunition, implements of war, or atomic energy materials.

Presidential determinations are made periodically as required by section 103 (b) of the Battle Act. This section provides that the President "may direct the continuance of . . . assistance to a country which permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials when . . . the cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States."

The Saint Lawrence Seaway

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON THE STATUS AND PROGRESS OF THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1955¹

The Seaway

The Saint Lawrence Seaway, which is being undertaken jointly by the Governments of the United States and Canada for their mutual security and economic benefit, will constitute a modernized waterway system with canals, seven locks and appurtenant facilities between Montreal and Lake Ontario, a distance of about 185 miles. Also involved is channel enlargement in open-river portions of this reach, as well as channel deepening in the existing 27-mile Welland Canal, connecting Lakes Ontario and Erie.

With these new facilities, modern ocean-going freighters can operate between the upper reaches of the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean through the Welland Canal and the improved Connecting Channels above Lake Erie. Normal water surface of Lake Superior is 602 feet above sea level.

Authorization of a project for deepening the Connecting Channels above Lake Erie in the Detroit, St. Clair and St. Marys Rivers, and in Lake St. Clair and the Straits of Mackinac is now pending in Congress. With such deepening, the controlling channel depth over the full inland route between Montreal and the head of the lakes will be increased to 27 feet.

The eastern frontier of the Great Lakes shipping fleet will be extended from Ogdensburg, New York, 600 miles to Seven Islands, Quebec, and to other points in the Saint Lawrence Gulf. Sailing

distance from the ocean to the head of the lakes is some 2,300 miles.

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (generally referred to herein as "the Corporation") is constructing the navigational improvements in United States territory within the 114-mile International Section of the St. Lawrence River, extending from Lake Ontario downstream to St. Regis, New York. The International Section is generally divided into the Thousand Islands Section and the International Rapids Section.

These navigational improvements include (1) the 10-mile Long Sault Canal with two locks and appurtenant facilities which include highway and railway relocation, bridge construction, and a highway tunnel under one of the locks in the International Rapids Section of the river near Massena, New York; (2) channel enlargement in the eastern approach to the Long Sault Canal adjacent to Cornwall Island; (3) lowering of scattered obstructive rock shoals in the Thousand Islands Section, chiefly in the vicinity of Alexandria Bay, New York, and (4) navigation channel markings.

These works, together with the concurrent navigational improvements being provided by Canada between Lake Erie and Montreal, and the related power development in the 46-mile International Rapids Section, Ogdensburg to St. Regis, New York, being performed by the Power Authority of the State of New York in conjunction with the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, will afford a channel from Lake Erie to Montreal with a controlling depth of 27 feet.

¹ Transmitted to the President by the Administrator of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation on Dec. 15 and by the President to the Congress on Jan. 12. (H. Doc. 293, 84th Cong., 2d sess.).

Channel, canal and lock dimensions and other features of the United States portion are as follows:

Minimum channel width in river	450 feet
Bottom width of Long Sault Canal	442 feet
Lock dimensions and data:	
Width	80 feet
Length, between upper and lower service gates	860 feet
Usable length	768 feet
Minimum depth over sills	30 feet
Maximum lift	49 feet
Service gates	miter type
Emergency gate (upper lock)	vertical lift
Height of lower miter gates	85 feet

This modernization will change the controlling channel depth over this waterway, Lake Erie to Montreal, from 14 to 27 feet, reduce the number of lift locks to be transited by ships from 25 to 14, and add seven new locks with controlling dimensions of 768 x 80 x 30 feet as compared to existing controlling dimensions of 252 x 44 x 14 feet.

The scheduled completion date for the new United States Seaway works for initial navigation service is July, 1958. This is the target date for the creation of the power pool in the International Rapids Section, which pool will also serve the Seaway. Full-scale navigation service of these new deep-water seaway facilities being constructed by both countries is expected to begin with the 1959 shipping season.

Organization

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation was established by Public Law 358, 83d Congress, 68 Stat. 92, approved May 13, 1954. It is subject to the direction and supervision of the President, or the head of such agency as he may designate. By Executive Order 10534, dated June 9, 1954, this responsibility was given to the Secretary of Defense.

During the month of August, 1955, Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert B. Anderson, who had been exercising this supervisory authority on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, resigned from his post, and Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker was chosen by Secretary of Defense Wilson to succeed to the responsibilities of executive supervision of the Corporation.

The Corporation is charged with the responsibility of constructing, operating and maintaining

the United States share of the Saint Lawrence Seaway works located in the Thousand Islands Section (68 miles) and International Rapids Section (46 miles) of the Saint Lawrence River, in the interest of national security and economic development.

The Corporation is authorized (1) to consummate certain arrangements with The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction of the Seaway between Lake Erie and Montreal; (2) to finance the United States share of the Seaway costs on a self-liquidating basis by the issuance of revenue bonds to the United States Treasury; (3) to establish with the Canadian Authority mutually satisfactory arrangements for the coordinated control and operation of the Seaway; (4) to negotiate with Canada on agreements for tolls and other purposes, and (5) to coordinate its activities with those connected with the correlated power development.

The Corporation is an instrumentality of the United States operating under the management of an Administrator, a Deputy Administrator, and an Advisory Board, consisting of five members, all of whom are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The officials, the Advisory Board, and the Board of Engineering Consultants of the Corporation are:

Lewis G. Castle, Administrator
 Martin W. Oetersshagen, Deputy Administrator
 Raymond F. Stellar, Engineer
 E. Reece Harrill, Comptroller-Treasurer
 Edward R. Place, Information Officer
 Edward L. Lacey, Administrative Officer
 Guerin Todd, Jr., General Counsel

Advisory Board

John C. Beukema, North Muskegon, Michigan
 Harry C. Brockel, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Kenneth M. Lloyd, Youngstown, Ohio
 Hugh Moore, Easton, Pennsylvania
 Edward J. Noble, New York, New York

Board of Engineering Consultants

C. E. Blee, Knoxville, Tennessee
 F. W. Edwards, Muscatine, Iowa
 E. Mounford Fuelik, Chicago, Illinois
 Charles M. Wellons, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

On September 2, 1954, pursuant to Section 8 of the Act creating the Corporation, the Corporation designated the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to serve as its design, contracting and construction agent.

The design and construction are subject to the

direction and approval of the Corporation. Construction is performed by private contractors under competitive bidding.

Officers of the Corps of Engineers concerned with this work include:

Lieutenant General S. D. Sturgis, Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C.
Major General Charles G. Holle, Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, Washington, D.C.
Brigadier General Paul D. Berrigan, Division Engineer, Chicago, Illinois
Colonel Loren W. Olmstead, District Engineer, Buffalo, New York

Colonel Olmstead is the Contracting Officer. These and other officers of the Corps of Engineers and their civilian staffs participate in engineering design, construction scheduling and construction superintendence.

In addition to its supervisory functions, the Corporation coordinates its activities with other Federal Agencies, and the following entities:

The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada
Power Authority of the State of New York
Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario
Saint Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers
International Joint Commission

Financing

In order to finance the construction of the United States portion of the Seaway, the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury revenue bonds payable from Corporation shipping toll revenues, with the provision that not to exceed \$105 million shall be outstanding at any one time. It is further provided that not to exceed 10 percentum of the authorized bonds shall be issued during the first year and not to exceed 40 percentum during any subsequent year. The obligations of the Corporation shall have maturities agreed upon by the Secretary of the Treasury not in excess of 50 years, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Since the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation's project is created by law as a self-liquidating undertaking, the Corporation is required to recover from toll revenues all costs of operating and maintaining the works under the administration of the Corporation, including depreciation, payment of interest on the obligations of the Corporation, and payments in lieu of taxes. In addition, the Corporation's revenue from tolls

must be sufficient to amortize the obligations of the Corporation over a period not to exceed 50 years.

The Corporation has given special consideration to the subject of its responsibilities under the enabling act and has had extensive consultations with other interested agencies of the government concerning the activities and operations of the Seaway which should be financed by the Corporation, and as to the inclusion of the cost in the toll base.

In ruling on a specific case relating to the installation, maintenance and operation of aids to navigation, the Comptroller General rendered a decision B-215817, dated November 2, 1955, in which he stated:

These provisions (of Public Law 358, 83rd Congress) reasonably establish an intent by the Congress that responsibility for the administration and cost of the United States portion of the Seaway should be solely that of the Corporation and that all costs related to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Seaway should be recovered from the tolls collected. . . .

The Corporation is authorized and directed to negotiate with The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, or such other agency as may be designated by the Government of Canada, an agreement as to the rules for the measurement of vessels and cargoes, and the rates of charges or tolls to be levied for the use of the Saint Lawrence Seaway, and for an equitable division of the revenues of the Seaway between the Corporation and The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada.

The financial statement and summary cost and progress report for the year ended June 30, 1955, appear at the conclusion of this report.²

Review of Progress and Status of Project

The efforts of the Corporation for the past fiscal year were devoted primarily to organization, to the initiation of design and construction programs in conjunction with the Corps of Engineers, to coordinating negotiations with The Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and the Power Authority of the State of New York, and to the awarding of initial contracts for the construction effort.

Seaway Corporation headquarters for administrative direction were established in Washington, D.C., in July, 1954. The headquarters consist of

² Not printed here.

the Office of the Administrator, the Engineer, the Comptroller-Treasurer, the Information Officer, and the Administrative Officer.

To provide the most efficient working arrangements at the field level with the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, the Corporation established an office in Buffalo, New York, to be operated during the engineering-design and contract-award period in order to expedite day-to-day supervision and processing of engineering and related matters, and supervision of construction activities. The Deputy Administrator with a small staff is presently stationed at Buffalo.

Ground was broken in April, 1955, for the excavation of the 10-mile Long Sault Canal and Locks. A subsidiary office was established in Massena, New York, near the principal worksite of the United States Seaway construction, for the purpose of coordinating, supervising, and representing the Corporation there. Later the Massena office will be the central office and main point of operation for the Corporation when the Seaway is open for traffic. A satisfactory building site has been selected in Massena for an Administration Building, which is scheduled to be completed for occupancy in June, 1957, after which it will become the headquarters of the Corporation.

Throughout the year, concentrated effort was applied to engineering design work originated for the Corporation primarily by the Buffalo District Office of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. Also hydraulic model studies have been under way in laboratories located at Vicksburg, Mississippi; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Islington, Ontario; together with extensive hydrographic surveying and probing in the river areas where channel enlargement is involved.

Contracts for major excavation and related dike construction have been awarded in a total amount of \$11 million for the removal of 22 million cubic yards of glacial till, clay, and rock, and for dike and embankment work. At the end of June, the overburden excavation included in these contracts was approximately 12 percent complete for the Robinson Bay Lock site, and about 11 percent complete for the Grasse River Lock site.

By the end of 1955, overburden excavation for each lock site was substantially more than half completed, and the excavation for the upper end of the Long Sault Canal was about half finished. The over-all design effort was well advanced toward completion. Summing up the first con-

struction season, 9 percent of the total work has been completed in terms of cost amounting to \$8 million.

Seaway contractors are generally working two 10-hour shifts, in daylight, and at night under floodlights, to meet contract completion dates. Construction activity will be restricted during the winter season, but work will be continued to the maximum practicable extent.

Principal project contractors are:

Peter Kiewit Sons' Company, Omaha, Nebraska, and Morris-Knudsen Company, Inc., New York, New York (joint venture), for the main portion of the Long Sault Canal.

Badgett Mine Stripping Corporation, Madisonville, Kentucky, westerly end of the canal.

Tecor Corporation, Dallas, Texas, at Robinson Bay Lock site.

Dutcher Construction Corporation, Queenstown, Maryland, at the Grasse River Lock site.

During the fall, a materials testing laboratory at Massena was erected. Work was well advanced on a 2½ mile section of highway in the Long Sault area.

In February, 1955, negotiations were concluded between the United States and Canada,³ whereby the United States approved deferment of the construction of the authorized Point Rockway Canal and Lock below Ogdensburg, New York. In lieu thereof, Canada is building the Iroquois Canal and Lock on the opposite side of the river. As stated in an exchange of diplomatic notes with Canada, these arrangements "eliminate uneconomical duplication of navigation facilities" and "retain the development on a joint basis."

By another exchange of notes,⁴ agreement was reached by the two Seaway entities for the joint construction of a bridge across Polly's Gut between the mainland of the United States and Cornwall Island in Canada. This will be a combined railway-highway bridge crossing the international boundary northeast of Massena, New York, in replacement of the existing South Channel bridge at Cornwall Island, a low-level fixed structure which will have to be removed to permit passage of Seaway shipping.

Members of United States and Canadian Committees were appointed on March 25, 1955, to initiate preliminary toll studies. These committees have held several meetings, the first of which took

³ BULLETIN of MAR. 14, 1955, p. 437.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Dec. 12, 1955, p. 978.

place at Montreal in June. Members designated are:

United States Committee
E. Reece Harrill, Chairman
Dr. Charles A. Taff
H. M. Hochfeld
Canadian Committee
Charles Gavsie, Chairman
J. C. Lessard
G. A. Scott

On September 22, 1955, Secretary of the Army Brucker made an inspection tour of the project, and proceeded on to Ottawa to meet with the executive staff of the Canadian Seaway Authority, as well as Canadian Government Department of Defense personnel.

Lieutenant General Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with Generals C. G. Holle, Paul D. Berrigan, and C. R. Smith, and Colonel L. W. Olmstead also made an inspection tour of the project in September. Relations with the Corps have been exceedingly cordial, and their cooperation and services have meant a great deal in the successful development and progress of the project.

During the year, three meetings were held with the members of the Corporation's Advisory Board. Their contributions have been of great value.

The Corporation's Board of Engineering Consultants is composed of engineers who have specialized in hydraulics, soils, foundations, and canal design, and have had wide experience in other branches of engineering. They have rendered valuable service in the review and solution of major engineering problems.

Several meetings have been held in Ottawa, Montreal, and Washington with the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, President of The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, and his staff. The agenda of these meetings included toll studies and also considerable exchange of engineering viewpoints and coordination of design and construction matters which were mutually beneficial. Relations with this Canadian counterpart of the Corporation are most harmonious, and the two entities

are working in an atmosphere of cooperative understanding.

The Corporation and the Coast Guard have entered into a memorandum of understanding whereby the Corporation will utilize the technical services of the Coast Guard on a reimbursable basis in developing plans and specifications for the installation of the aids to navigation for the United States waters of the Seaway. The aids to be installed, operated and maintained by the Corporation will be within the Thousand Islands and International Rapids Section of the Saint Lawrence River comprising the 114-mile reach from Lake Ontario downstream to St. Regis.

The Corporation will operate and maintain the locks, canals, channels, and navigational aids, and perform related work, including the collection of tolls. Accordingly, the organization is in the process of expansion to meet these responsibilities.

Cumulative public interest of recent years in the Seaway manifested itself during the first construction season by an ever-increasing influx of visitors to Massena and the St. Lawrence Valley. To accommodate visitors desiring to view the Seaway-Power projects in complete safety and without interference with operations, the Corporation, as well as the New York State Power Authority, provided "overlook stations" at several vantage points. The two entities jointly published educational folders to satisfy many thousands of requests received from the general public for information.

The Corporation wishes to acknowledge with deep appreciation the whole-hearted cooperation it has received from a number of government agencies, particularly the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense, in the performance of its activities.

Correction

BULLETIN of January 30, 1956, p. 176, second column: The first word in line 10 should be "identify."

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings¹

Adjourned During January 1956

U. N. Ecosoc Human Rights Commission: 8th Session of Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.	New York	Jan. 3-20
SEATO Committee of Economic Experts: Working Group	Bangkok	Jan. 5-11
U. N. ECAFE Inland Transport Committee: 5th Session	Bangkok	Jan. 9-14
WHO Committee on Administration and Finance	Geneva	Jan. 9-16
SEATO Committee of Economic Experts	Bangkok	Jan. 12-18
Royal Agricultural and Food Exhibition	Colombo (Ceylon)	Jan. 12-26
International Tin Study Group: 31st Meeting of Management Committee.	Brussels	Jan. 16 (1 day)
UNREF Standing Program Subcommittee: 2d Meeting	Geneva	Jan. 18-20
UNREF Executive Committee: 2d Session	Geneva	Jan. 23-27
FAO/ECE Joint Working Party on Forest and Forest Products Statistics.	Geneva	Jan. 23-28
WMO Working Group on Telecommunications of Regional Association V (Southwest Pacific).	Melbourne	Jan. 23-28*
Caribbean Commission/FAO Technical Conference on Cooperatives.	Georgetown (British Guiana)	Jan. 24-31
U. N. ECAFE Committee on Industry and Trade: 8th Session	Bangalore (India)	Jan. 24-31
International Sugar Council	London	Jan. 25-26

In Session as of January 31, 1956

North Pacific Fur Seal Conference	Washington	Nov. 28-
International Fair for Peace and Progress	Ciudad Trujillo (Dominican Republic).	Dec. 20-
U. N. Trusteeship Council: Standing Committee on Petitions	New York	Jan. 3-
Who Executive Board: 17th Session	Geneva	Jan. 17-
Inter-American Council of Jurists: 3d Meeting	México, D. F.	Jan. 17-
GATT Contracting Parties: 1956 Tariff Negotiations	Geneva	Jan. 18-

Scheduled February 1-April 30, 1956

U. N. Economic Commission for the Far East: 12th Session	Bangalore (India)	Feb. 2-
Pan American Highway Congresses: Technical Committee on Terminology.	Buenos Aires	Feb. 7-
U. N. Trusteeship Council: 17th Session	New York	Feb. 7-
FAO Forestry and Forest Products Commission for Asia and Pacific: Subcommittee on Teak.	Bangkok	Feb. 9-
Inter-American Travel Congresses: Technical Committee on Travel Promotion.	México, D.F.	Feb. 13-
ICAO Panel on Vertical Separation of Aircraft: 1st Meeting	Montreal	Feb. 14-
ICEM Executive Committee: 4th Session	Geneva	Feb. 14-
U. N./WMO International Hurricane Seminar	Ciudad Trujillo (Dominican Republic)	Feb. 16-
ICEM Council: 4th Session	Geneva	Feb. 20-
ICAO North Atlantic Regional Air Traffic Control Meeting	Montreal	Feb. 20-
Pan American Highway Congresses: Technical Committee on Financing of the Pan American Highway.	Caracas	Feb. 20-
U. N. International Wheat Conference: 2d Session	Geneva	Feb. 20-
Inter-American Travel Congresses: Technical Committee on Travel Barriers.	Buenos Aires	Feb. 21-

¹ Prepared in the Office of International Conferences, Jan. 24, 1956. Asterisks indicate tentative dates. Following is a list of abbreviations: U. N., United Nations; Ecosoc, Economic and Social Council; SEATO, Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty Organization; ECAFE, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; WHO, World Health Organization; UNREF, United Nations Refugee Fund; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; WMO, World Meteorological Organization; GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization; ICEM, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; ILO, International Labor Organization; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; Iru, International Telecommunication Union; UNICEF, United Nations Children's Fund; UPU, Universal Postal Union; OAS, Organization of American States.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Scheduled February 1–April 30, 1956—Continued

U. N. Trusteeship Council: Standing Committee on Administrative Unions.	New York	Feb. 21–
International Atomic Energy Agency: Working-Level Meeting on Draft Statute.	Washington	Feb. 27–
Ilo Governing Body: 131st Session	Geneva	Feb. 27–
Inter-American Travel Congresses: 2d Meeting of Permanent Executive Committee.	Lima	Feb. 27–
U. N. Ecosoc Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations .	New York	Feb. 27–
International Telecommunication Union: Meeting of Chairmen of Seven Ccrr and Ccrr Study Groups.	Geneva	Feb. 29–
Fao Intergovernmental Consultation on Epizootics	Paris	February
UNESCO Committee on International Exchange of Publications .	Paris	February
U. N. ECAFE Subcommittee on Electric Power	India	Mar. 5–
U. N. Ecosoc Commission on Human Rights: 12th Session . .	New York	Mar. 5–
ITU International Radio Consultative Committee (Ccrr): Study Group XI, Color Television Demonstrations.	New York	Mar. 5–
UNICEF Executive Board and Program Committee	New York	Mar. 5–
SEATO Council	Karachi	Mar. 6–
Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences: 1st Meeting of Technical Advisory Council.	Turrialba (Costa Rica)	Mar. 8–
Wmo Regional Association VI (Europe): 2d Session	Dubrovnik (Yugoslavia)	Mar. 12–
U. N. Ecosoc Commission on Status of Women: 10th Session . .	Geneva	Mar. 13–
Inter-American Specialized Conference on the Conservation of the Resources of the Continental Shelf and Marine Waters.	Ciudad Trujillo (Dominican Republic)	Mar. 15–
U. N. ECAFE Railway Subcommittee: 4th Session	New Delhi	Mar. 15–
8th International Congress on the Vineyard and Wine	Santiago	Mar. 19–
11th International Congress of Agricultural and Food Industries .	Santiago	Mar. 20–
U. N. ECAFE: 4th Regional Conference of Statisticians	Bangkok	Mar. 26–
ITU International Radio Consultative Committee (Ccrr): Study Group XI, Color Television Demonstrations.	Paris	Mar. 27–
U. N. Scientific Committee on Radiation: 1st Meeting	New York	March *
UNESCO Conference of Experts on the Cultural Integration of Immigrants.	Caracas	March *
Icao: 3d Caribbean Regional Air Navigation Meeting	Ciudad Trujillo (Dominican Republic)	Apr. 3–
ITU International Radio Consultative Committee (Ccrr): Study Group XI, Color Television Demonstrations.	London	Apr. 3–
9th Pan American Railway Congress	Buenos Aires	Apr. 3–
U. N. Economic Commission for Europe: 11th Session	Geneva	Apr. 3–
Ilo Petroleum Committee: 5th Session (reconvened)	Geneva	Apr. 4–
UNESCO Executive Board: 43d Session	Madrid	Apr. 9–
International Instrumentation-Automation Exhibition	Oslo	Apr. 9–
9th International Film Festival	Cannes	Apr. 10–
ITU International Radio Consultative Committee (Ccrr): Study Group XI, Color Television Demonstrations.	The Hague	Apr. 10–
UNESCO Conference on Asian-U. S. Cultural Relations	United States	Apr. 10–
6th Inter-American Travel Congress	San José (Costa Rica)	Apr. 12–
U. N. Ecosoc Statistical Commission: 9th Session	New York	Apr. 16–
ITU International Telegraphic Consultative Committee (Ccrr): Study Group IV, Phototelegraphy and Facsimile.	London	Apr. 17–
U. N. Economic and Social Council: 21st Session	New York	Apr. 17–
ITU Administrative Council: 11th Session	Geneva	Apr. 21–
South Pacific Commission: 3d Session of the Conference . .	Suva, Fiji	Apr. 23–
ITU International Telegraphic Consultative Committee (Ccrr): Study Group V, Joint Ccrr/Ccrr Committee on Phototelegraphy.	London	Apr. 23–
U. N. Ecosoc Commission on Narcotic Drugs: 11th Session . .	Geneva	Apr. 23–
Wmo Executive Committee: 8th Session	Geneva	Apr. 24–
Wmo Eastern Caribbean Hurricane Committee of Regional Association IV (North and Central America): 4th Session.	Ciudad Trujillo (Dominican Republic)	Apr. 25–
5th International Philatelic Exhibition	New York	Apr. 28–
Ilo Coal Mines Committee: 6th Session	Istanbul	Apr. 30–
UPU Executive and Liaison Committee	Bern	Apr. 30–
Inter-American Ministers of Education: 2d Meeting	Lima	April
Pan American Highway Congresses: 2d Meeting of Permanent Executive Committee.	Washington	April
U. N. Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: 7th Session.	New York	April
UNESCO/OAS Regional Conference on Free and Compulsory Education in Latin America.	Lima	April

Renewed Efforts for Disarmament

Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.¹

This fiftieth meeting of the Disarmament Commission finds us standing at a crossroads in our quest for agreement.

The resolution of the General Assembly of December 12² points to a new and hopeful path. By the overwhelming vote of 56 to 7 the General Assembly has urged us to adopt and execute President Eisenhower's plan for aerial inspection for peace and for exchange of military information. By agreeing to this plan, which could also incorporate Marshal Bulganin's proposal for ground observers, we would at one stroke free the world from the fear of its final war. The resolution also speaks favorably of British, French, and Indian proposals. The United Nations never took a more hopeful action for peace than it did when it adopted this resolution. The countries, therefore, who are represented on this Commission never faced a greater opportunity.

Now I have just heard the representative of the Soviet Union [Arkady A. Sobolev] say that the United States has withdrawn—that is the verb—has withdrawn its support of disarmament. I have heard him say that the United States is backing out—he used that phrase I think at least twice, maybe three times—backing out. I leave it to the members of the Commission to account for this extraordinary statement. I am sure that I cannot because it flies squarely in the face of the facts.

For example, the General Assembly resolution under the authority of which we are meeting this afternoon directs us to start now on any and all measures of disarmament which seem feasible in the near future, which can be adequately safeguarded, and which can be carried out without waiting for full agreement on a comprehensive plan in all its stages. Here it is. You can find it for yourself on page 2, operative paragraph 1 (b), subparagraph ii: "All such measures of adequately safeguarded disarmament as are now feasible." The United States voted for that in common with most of us here around this table. Far

from representing a backing out or a withdrawing, this represents a forward step.

The United States remains pledged to work for, it earnestly desires, and it energetically seeks a comprehensive, progressive, enforceable agreement for the reduction of military expenditures, arms, armaments, and armed forces under effective international inspection and control. We are ready to consider any reasonable approach to that goal, including the method of limited approaches or installments, each of which would narrow disagreement and foster an increase of confidence so that the deadlock can be broken. We think that the President's plan would lead promptly and directly to these objectives, that it would promote that international confidence which is indispensable to agreement, that it would provide practical experience in many of the control and inspection measures required to supervise a disarmament agreement.

Well, now, so much for those remarks of the Soviet representative. As has been said here by many members, the immediate task before our meeting is to establish procedures for both the Commission and its subcommittee to pursue these objectives as suggested in paragraph 5 of the General Assembly resolution. I share the view expressed here that it would be most fruitful for the subcommittee to resume its work at the earliest opportunity, in the light of the General Assembly resolution. It seems to us that it should take no more than about 6 weeks to at least get an interim report on the prospects for progress and that at that time the subcommittee would do well to make a report to the Commission.

We hope that this procedure will commend itself to all concerned and that the members of the subcommittee can then arrange through diplomatic channels for an early meeting to resume their deliberations.

Let me say that the United States hopes and believes that when the subcommittee meets again it will be guided by the General Assembly resolution and that this will give it a sense of new urgency and of renewed dedication.

For people in my country, and throughout the world, the General Assembly resolution endorsing the Eisenhower-Bulganin plan has raised great hopes. And, gentlemen, I would be less than frank if I did not say that there was widespread disappointment that the Soviet Union did not join with

¹ Made in the U.N. Disarmament Commission on Jan. 23 (U.S./U.N. press release 2343). Ambassador Lodge is U.S. Representative on the Commission.

² BULLETIN of Jan. 9, 1956, p. 63.

the rest of the world in this great manifest of peaceful purpose which would convert air power into peace power, which would open the skies of the world to the advancement of peace.

Gentlemen, let us face it. The world *cannot* believe that any nation which truly hates war, which harbors no aggressive intent, which is ready to outlaw surprise attack from any quarter, can fail to open up its skies to this peaceful inspection, to join in this collective effort for peace.

For this reason I cannot believe that any government can long deny its people this insurance against war because to do so would lay such a government open to the suspicion of contemplating an aggression. No one here wants such a suspicion entertained about himself, or any other member, for that matter.

We believe therefore that the day must come when the guard for peace will be mounted in the sky above the Soviet Union as it will be above the United States.³

Improving Hotel Facilities in the Western Hemisphere¹

Problems of hotel development in Latin America were studied by a technical committee of the Inter-American Travel Congresses at an initial 5-day meeting at the Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., December 12-16, 1955. The discussions resulted in a series of conclusions pointing out important objectives in improving hotel facilities and thereby increasing the volume of international travel in the Western Hemisphere.

Government interest in the work of the committee was demonstrated by the fact that, although only eight countries comprise its basic membership, a total of 13 were represented at the meeting. These were Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Peru, Paraguay, and the United States. In addition, special observers were present from the following international organizations which maintain cooperative

¹The Commission on Jan. 23 agreed that the subcommittee should resume its talks and submit an interim report to the Commission in about 6 weeks.

³This report of the meeting of the technical committee was prepared by H. H. Kelly of the Commerce Department, who was U.S. representative at the meeting and also served as its chairman.

relations with the Organization of American States: Inter-American Hotel Association, Inter-American Federation of Automobile Clubs, American Road Builders' Association, and International Road Federation. Secretariat services were provided by the Pan American Union.

This group, officially known as the Technical Committee on Travel Plant, was the first of four committees recently established for the Inter-American Travel Congresses, a governmental body sponsored by the Organization of American States. The other three deal with research and organization, removal of travel barriers, and travel promotion and publicity. They are expected to hold similar meetings before the 6th Inter-American Travel Congress is held at San José, Costa Rica, April 12-22, 1956.

At the Washington meeting, for which the United States provided the chairmanship, the Technical Committee on Travel Plant reviewed the broad field of its work. It recognized the important efforts now being put forth by private and public interests in the hotel field in Latin America and concentrated its initial attention upon subjects which appeared to be most practical and useful for action by an intergovernmental group.

Its final report set forth findings and conclusions on numerous subjects pertaining to the improvement and expansion of tourist facilities in the Latin American countries. Decision was made to obtain up-to-date information on existing hotel accommodations and those now under construction, outstanding problems hindering the construction of new hotels, and the various jurisdictions which establish sanitary requirements for hotels and eating places. The committee urged governments to increase their incentives for hotel construction and expansion by such measures as customs facilities on importation of materials and equipment, admission of expert personnel from other countries, and national hotel credit to provide long-term loans at low rates of interest. Importance of protecting the health of travelers was stressed, and the national public health services were invited to prepare special papers for the 6th Inter-American Travel Congress, giving particular attention to minimum standards for health and sanitary requirements. Governments were urged to take early action to provide adequate and safe lodging and other facilities along the

route of the Inter-American Highway from Guatemala to Panama inclusive, which may be open to through traffic within the next 3 or 4 years. Additional capital for the building or expansion of hotel establishments was recognized as a basic need, and emphasis was placed on private resources, both domestic and foreign. Other subjects on which policy decisions were made included the desirability of organizing national hotel associations, establishment of hotel training schools, and effective business relationships between hotels and travel agencies.

The report will be submitted to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council of the Organization of American States and to the Permanent Executive Committee of the Inter-American Travel Congresses and will provide a basis for further action at the 6th Congress next April.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Inter-American Council of Jurists

The Department of State announced on January 16 (press release 23) that the U.S. Government will be represented by the following delegation at the third meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists at Mexico City beginning January 17:

U.S. Representative

William Sanders, Counselor of Embassy, American Embassy, Santiago

Alternate U.S. Representatives

George H. Owen, U.S. member on the Inter-American Juridical Committee and Counselor of Embassy, American Embassy, Rio de Janeiro

David B. Karrick, Washington, D. C.

Advisers

William G. Bowdler, Office of Regional American Affairs, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State

Marjorie M. Whiteman, Assistant Legal Adviser for Inter-American Affairs, Department of State

Under the terms of the charter of the Organization of American States (OAS), the Inter-American Council of Jurists is one of the three principal organs of the Council of the OAS. The other two principal organs are the Inter-American Economic and Social Council and the Inter-American Cultural Council.

The purpose of the Inter-American Council of

Jurists, as stated in article 67 of the charter of the OAS, is "to serve as an advisory body on juridical matters; to promote the development and codification of public and private international law; and to study the possibility of attaining uniformity in the legislation of the various American countries, insofar as it may appear desirable." The work of the Council is performed both at its regular full-scale meetings, the first and second having been held, respectively, at Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires in 1950 and 1953, and by its permanent committee, the Inter-American Juridical Committee at Rio de Janeiro.

FAO-Caribbean Commission Technical Conference on Cooperatives

The Department of State announced on January 19 (press release 34) that the U.S. Government will be represented at the joint FAO-Caribbean Commission Technical Conference on Cooperatives, to be held at Georgetown, British Guiana, January 23-31, by the following delegates:

Kelsey Beeler Gardner, *Chairman*, Director, Management Services Division, Farmer Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture

Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., Assistant to the Under Secretary of Labor

W. H. Stolting, Assistant Chief, Economics and Cooperative Marketing Section, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior

This will be the second conference resulting from the desire of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Caribbean Commission to assist in the development of rural cooperatives as a means of removing or reducing the disadvantages under which rural people suffer; enabling rural people to participate in government programs for increasing the production of food, raising nutritional levels, and improving the distribution of agricultural and other commodities; and stimulating the economic and social betterment of people in underdeveloped areas. The first conference was held at Trinidad in January 1951.

The second conference will deal, in particular, with questions relating to (1) training facilities for government cooperative staff and for the employees of cooperatives; (2) coordination with other technical staff of the work done by specialized cooperative personnel; (3) cooperative processing and marketing of agricultural produce; (4)

cooperatives for the supply of fishing requisites and for the marketing of fish; (5) relationship between cooperatives and other credit institutions; and (6) taxation of cooperatives.

In addition to member governments of the Caribbean Commission (France, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States) and the 14 associated local administrations, the following governments, agencies, and institutions have been invited to send observers to the conference: Cuba; Dominican Republic; Haiti; United Nations; U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America; International Labor Organization; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; Pan American Union; and Holy See.

Second Session of U.N. Refugee Committee

Press release 38 dated January 21

The U.N. Refugee Fund Executive Committee is to hold its second session at Geneva, Switzerland, beginning on January 23, 1956.

Christopher H. Phillips, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, is the U.S. representative on the Executive Committee.

Mr. Phillips will be assisted by Edward W. Lawrence, Chief, Program Division, Office of the Field Coordinator, Frankfurt on the Main, Germany.

The U.N. Refugee Fund Executive Committee is the successor to the U.N. High Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Refugees. By a resolution of December 14, 1950, the General Assembly of the United Nations created a High Commissioner's Office for Refugees to provide for the legal and political protection of refugees and displaced persons. In 1951 an Advisory Committee on Refugees was created by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to advise the High Commissioner in the exercise of his functions. Action taken by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council during 1954 to authorize the High Commissioner to undertake a program for the promotion of permanent solutions for the problems of refugees, as well as to make appeals for funds for this program, made it imperative that a new body be created to maintain continuous review of that program or that the terms of reference and composition of the existing Advisory

Committee be expanded. At its 19th session (March 29-April 7, 1955), the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations reconstituted the Advisory Committee as the "United Nations Refugee Fund Executive Committee" and adopted new terms of reference for the committee.¹

The members of the Executive Committee are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iran, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, the Vatican, and Venezuela.

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography

Security Council

Letter dated 30 November 1955 from the Representative of Saudi Arabia addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/3465, November 30, 1955. 2 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 6 December 1955 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/3481, December 9, 1955. 1 p. mimeo.

Letter dated 8 December 1955 from the Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/3482, December 9, 1955. 2 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 13 December 1955 from the Representative of Syria addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/3505, December 13, 1955. 2 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 15 December 1955 from the Representative of Egypt addressed to the Secretary-General. S/3514, December 15, 1955. 3 pp. mimeo.

Trusteeship Council

United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British Administration and Togoland under French Administration, 1955. Report on Togoland under British Administration. T/1210, November 15, 1955. 90 pp. mimeo.

United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British Administration and Togoland under French Administration, 1955. Report on Togoland under French Administration. T/1211, November 14, 1955. 105 pp. mimeo.

General Assembly Resolution 860 (IX): The Togoland Unification Problem and the Future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British Administration. Observations of the Administering Authority on the Mission's Report. T/1214, November 21, 1955. 7 pp. mimeo.

Economic and Social Council

Economic Commission for Latin America. Co-ordination with the Inter-American Economic and Social Council. Note by the Secretariat. E/Cn.12/381, August 20, 1955. 9 pp. mimeo.

Agenda of the Resumed Twentieth Session. Note by the Secretary-General. E/L.687, October 19, 1955. 3 pp. mimeo.

¹ BULLETIN of May 9, 1955, p. 784.

Policy on Regional Projects. Report of the Technical Assistance Board. E/TAC/47, November 1, 1955. 3 pp. mimeo.

Measures for the Cessation of National, Racial or Religious Hostility. Report by the Secretary-General. E/Cn.4/Sub.2/172, November 9, 1955. 51 pp. mimeo.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Germany

Agreement on German external debts. Signed at London February 27, 1953. Entered into force September 16, 1953. TIAS 2792.

Accession deposited: Peru, December 2, 1955.

North Atlantic Treaty

Agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for cooperation regarding atomic information. Signed at Paris June 22, 1955.¹

Notification of being bound by terms of the agreement: Iceland, January 16, 1956.

Trade and Commerce

International convention to facilitate the importation of commercial samples and advertising material. Dated at Geneva November 7, 1952. Entered into force November 20, 1955.²

Accession deposited: Australia, January 6, 1956.

BILATERAL

Cuba

Agreement concerning financial arrangements for the furnishing of certain supplies and services to naval vessels of both countries. Signed at Habana January 10, 1956. Will enter into force April 9, 1956 (90 days from the date of signature).

Korea

Agreement providing for the loan of three additional naval vessels to Korea. Effected by exchange of notes at Seoul December 28, 1955. Entered into force December 28, 1955.

Peru

Agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington January 25, 1956. Entered into force January 25, 1956.

¹ Not in force.

² Not in force for the United States.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Confirmations

The Senate on January 18 confirmed Max Waldo Bishop to be Ambassador to Thailand.

The Senate on January 25 confirmed the following:

Thomas C. Mann to be Ambassador to El Salvador

John D. Hickerson to be Ambassador to Finland

John J. Nuccio to be Ambassador to Iceland

Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., to be Ambassador to Luxembourg

Robert H. Thayer to be Minister to Rumania

THE DEPARTMENT

Confirmations

The Senate on January 25 confirmed Herbert V. Prochnow to be Deputy Under Secretary of State.

The Senate on January 25 confirmed Isaac W. Carpenter, Jr., to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: January 23-29

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press releases issued prior to January 23 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 23 of Jan. 16, 34 of Jan. 19, and 38 of Jan. 21.

No.	Date	Subject
39	1/23	Dulles: testimony on ICA.
40	1/24	Under Secretary Hoover to visit Germany (rewrite).
41	1/24	Dulles: news conference transcript.
42	1/25	Health: Middle East policy.
43	1/25	Katzen appointed consultant.
44	1/25	Upton appointed to Mixed Board at Bonn (rewrite).
45	1/26	Wadsworth designated U.S. representative for atomic energy agency negotiations (rewrite).
46	1/26	U.S. policy on treaty rights in Morocco.

American Republics

FAO-Caribbean Commission Technical Conference on Cooperatives 224

Improving Hotel Facilities in the Western Hemisphere 223

Inter-American Council of Jurists 224

Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference 195

Asia. SEATO Representatives Prepare for Meeting of Council 207

Atomic Energy

Ambassador Wadsworth To Represent U.S. in Atomic Agency Negotiations 210

Revised Regulation on Radioisotope Distribution 208

Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference 195

Canada. The Saint Lawrence Seaway (text of report) 215

China, Communist. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference 195

Congress, The

Continuation of Aid to Denmark, U.K., Italy (Hollister) 214

Integration of the International Cooperation Administration Within the Department of State (Dulles) 211

The Saint Lawrence Seaway (text of report) 215

Denmark. Continuation of Aid to Denmark, U.K., Italy (Hollister) 214

Disarmament. Renewed Efforts for Disarmament (Lodge) 222

Economic Affairs

FAO-Caribbean Commission Technical Conference on Cooperatives 224

The Saint Lawrence Seaway (text of report) 215

U.S.-Indian Cooperation for Economic Development (Cooper) 205

Foreign Service. Confirmations (Bishop, Buchanan, Hickerson, Mann, Muccio, Thayer) 226

Germany

Former Senator Upton Named to Mixed Board at Bonn 210

Under Secretary Hoover To Visit in Berlin and Bonn 210

Health, Education, and Welfare. U.S. Representatives on WHO Board 210

India

Allotment of \$50 Million to India for Economic Development 204

U.S.-Indian Cooperation for Economic Development (Cooper) 205

International Information. Mr. Katzen Appointed Consultant on Use of Funds in Israel 207

International Organizations and Meetings

Calendar of Meetings 220

FAO-Caribbean Commission Technical Conference on Cooperatives 224

Improving Hotel Facilities in the Western Hemisphere 223

Inter-American Council of Jurists 224

Iran. Letters of Credence (Amini) 207

Israel. Mr. Katzen Appointed Consultant on Use of Funds in Israel 207

Italy. Continuation of Aid to Denmark, U.K., Italy (Hollister) 214

Morocco. U.S. Policy on Treaty Rights in Morocco 204

Mutual Security

Allotment of \$50 Million to India for Economic Development 204

Continuation of Aid to Denmark, U.K., Italy (Hollister) 214

Integration of the International Cooperation Administration Within the Department of State (Dulles) 211

SEATO Representatives Prepare for Meeting of Council 207

Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference 195

U.S. Gives Viet-Nam \$37 Million for Refugee Resettlement 208

U.S.-Indian Cooperation for Economic Development (Cooper) 205

Near East

A Historical View of American Foreign Policy in the Middle East (Heath) 202

Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference 195

Presidential Documents. Exchange of Correspondence Between President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Bulganin 191

Refugees and Displaced Persons

Second Session of U.N. Refugee Committee 225

U.S. Gives Viet-Nam \$37 Million for Refugee Resettlement 208

State, Department of

Ambassador Wadsworth To Represent U.S. in Atomic Agency Negotiations 210

Confirmations (Carpenter, Prochnow) 226

Integration of the International Cooperation Administration Within the Department of State (Dulles) 211

Treaty Information

Current Actions 226

U.S. Policy on Treaty Rights in Morocco 204

U.S.S.R. Exchange of Correspondence Between President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Bulganin (letters, text of Soviet draft treaty) 191

United Kingdom

Continuation of Aid to Denmark, U.K., Italy (Hollister) 214

Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference 195

United Nations

Current U.N. Documents 225

Renewed Efforts for Disarmament (Lodge) 222

Second Session of U.N. Refugee Committee 225

U.S. Representatives on WHO Board 210

Viet-Nam. U.S. Gives Viet-Nam \$37 Million for Refugee Resettlement 208

Name Index

Amini, Ali 207
 Bishop, Max Waldo 226
 Brady, Frederick J. 210
 Buchanan, Wiley T., Jr. 226
 Bulganin, N. 193
 Carpenter, Isaac W. 226
 Cooper, John Sherman 205
 Dulles, Secretary 195, 211
 Eisenhower, President 191
 Heath, Donald R. 202
 Hickerson, John D. 226
 Hollister, John B. 214
 Hoover, Herbert, Jr. 210
 Katzen, Bernard 207
 Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr. 222
 Mann, Thomas C. 226
 Mayo, Charles W. 210
 Muccio, John J. 226
 Prochnow, Herbert V. 226
 Thayer, Robert H. 226
 Upton, Robert W. 210
 Wadsworth, James J. 210



the
Department
of
State

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$.....
(cash, check, or
money order).

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) came into existence on January 1, 1948, as an undertaking by eight of the most important world trading countries, including the United States. This agreement sets out general rules for the conduct of international trade and establishes standards for international cooperation through joint negotiation of the reduction of tariffs and the elimination of other barriers to free world trade. Today 34 countries participate in this unique international cooperative association. Together, they account for about 80 percent of world trade.

As a result of changes in world economic conditions since 1948, representatives of the countries participating in the General Agreement recently made an intensive review of its provisions. They proposed amendments which are designed to strengthen the agreement and to provide a permanent organization (Organization for Trade Cooperation) to administer the world trade rules. The amendments agreed upon will come into operation after approval by the contracting parties.

Two recent Department of State publications explain this important agreement and the proposed amendments:

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade . . .
Present Rules and Proposed Revisions 45 cents
(A comparative study.)

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade . . .
An Explanation of Its Provisions and the Proposed Amendments
Publication No. 5813 20 cents
(An explanation in layman's language.)

These publications may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Please send me copies of

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade . . .
Present Rules and Proposed Revisions

Please send me copies of

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade . . .
An Explanation of Its Provisions and the Proposed Amendments

Name:

Street Address:

City, Zone, and State:

AVOID
00